AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—FEBRUARY, 1893.—NO. 2.

VI · CAL · FEB · AN · MDCCCXCIII
O · TV · QVI · CORDA · OMNIVM
CHRISTIANAE · SAPIENTIAE · CVLTORVM
TIBI · AETERNO · VINCVLO · DEVINXISTI
LEO · XIII · PONT · OPTIME · MAXIME
QVI · VT · REGIAE · TVAE · POTESTATIS · VSV
PER · SVMMVM · NEFAS
PERDITORVM · HOMINVM · VI · DETINERIS
AMOR · PATERNVS · QVO · OMNES · FOVES
MAGIS · INCLARVIT
QVI · CHARITATE · PATRIAE · FERVENS
ITALIAM · TVAM · SUB · ALAS · CONGREGARE · VOLVISTI
IMPIORVM · FRAUDE · DECEPTA · RENVENTEM
QVI · **VIRVM · DOLORVM** · REFERS · CVIVS · VICARIA · FVNGERIS · POTESTATE
TE · POPVLI · SVSPICIVNT · SVORVM · IVRIVM
CVSTODEM · ET · VINDICEM · IMPAVIDVM
TE · VENERANTVR · OB · CHRISTIANVM · NOMEN
IN · DISSITIS · REGIONIBVS · EXCVLTVM · PROPOGATVM
SALVE · PATER · OPTIME · MAXIME
VOTA · FILIORVM · IN · AMERICAE · SEPT
ORIS · DEGENTIVM · EXCIPE
QVI · STVDIVM · ERGA · NOS · TVVM · IAMDIV · EXPERTI
ANNVM · L · HONORIS · TVI · REDEVNTEM
TIBI · EFFVSO · ANIMO · GRATVLAMVR
OBLATA · VOTA · MODERATOR · EPHEMERIDES · "RECENSIO · ECCLESIASTICA"
TIBI · DEMISSO · ANIMO · DEFERT
IN · TE · PATER · OCVLOS · DEFIXOS · GERIMVS
NE · APVD · NOS · CHRISTIANAE · SAPIENTIAE · SINCERVS · AMOR
CATHOLICAE · SEDI · DEVOTIO · FERVIDA · INTEPESCAT
NE · ANIMI · NIMIVM · SIBI · FIDENTES
RECTI · SPECIE · TVRPITER · DECEPTI · NVTANTES · IN · DEVIVM · ABEANT
NE · LEGES · DIVINA · SAPIENTIA · MORIBVS · INFORMANDIS
MALE · SANAE · AVRAE · POPVLARI · PERPERAM · OBSECVNDANDO
VIM · REMITTANT
IN · TE · OMNIS · SPES · NOSTRA · INNITITVR
TV · VERITATIS · CVSTOS · INFALLIBILIS · A · DEO · SIGNATVS
OB · TVAM · INCOLVMITATEM · VOTA · VOTIS · CVMVLAMVS
DVM · OBSEQVIVM · NOSTRVM · HVMILITER · TESTAMVR

THE NOACHIAN DELUGE.

PART II.

WE are now prepared to go a step further. The Deluge was not, as we may believe, universal as to the earth's surface, nor as to the destruction of all forms of animal life. Was it, excluding those who were in the ark, universal as to man? Until the last few years scarcely any one would have thought of giving other than an affirmative answer to this question.

Whatever views may have been entertained as to the geographical universality of the Deluge, it was almost, if not quite, unanimously believed that no exception could be made to the total destruction of our race, except that stated in the seventh chapter of Genesis, where only Noah and his family are explicitly excluded from the all-destroying cataclysm. To question, and much more, to deny, the universality of the Deluge was, and is still, with the majority of the people, considered tantamount to impugning the authority of the Bible, or rejecting an article of faith. Nevertheless, if the question be examined without any preconceived notions, in the light of modern research and true exegesis, and with the seriousness and thoroughness to which it is entitled, it will, we think, be found that one may be justified in holding different views from those which have been so long current. This may, doubtless, surprise some of our readers, and yet we make the statement deliberately and with a full knowledge of all the objections urged against such an interpretation. We know that we are mooting a question that was not seriously discussed until a few years ago, and calling attention to a theory that has as yet but few defenders. But is it not one of the objects of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW to examine the latest phases of modern thought, to consider the theories that are now agitating the thinking world, as well as inform its readers regarding facts and principles about which there can be no controversy? And if so, is it not our right, as well as our privilege, to scrutinize what we may believe, as well as what we must believe; to discuss

hypothesis and theories as well as doctrines and dogmas? And are we not justified, therefore, in pushing our investigations to the farthest limits permitted by reason and sound criticism? We think there can be but one answer to these queries—that we should fail to keep abreast with the advance of modern discovery and modern thought, if we should not avail ourselves of all the sources of information that are placed at our disposal, and examine, as far as may be, even the tentative efforts that have in view the solution of problems in which all students have been more or less interested from time immemorial.

It will clear the way somewhat to premise that neither the Church, nor the Fathers, nor the Schools have ever defined or taught that the universal destruction of mankind by the Flood, excepting, of course, those in the ark, is of faith. In this respect there is the same liberty of belief as there is regarding the geographical universality of the Deluge. And the principles laid down, and the quotations from the Fathers and theologians, which have been given as bearing on the latter case, apply with equal force and truth to the former. There has been, it may be admitted, a common consent, which there was not until recently any reason for disputing, that all men, except Noah and his family, were destroyed, but it may, we think, be safely asserted that this common consent never amounted to anything more than an opinion, to stand or fall according to the evidence with which it might be supported. We have seen that the absolute expressions "all the earth," *omnis terra*, and "all flesh," *omnis caro*, may be used in a restricted sense, that science demands it, that exegesis allows it. The question now presents itself naturally and logically: Cannot the universal terms "all men," *universi homines*, be likewise interpreted in a similar sense? There is certainly nothing in the narrative of the Deluge, nor in any collateral text bearing upon the subject, that precludes such an interpretation. Besides, the laws of logic and hermeneutics oblige us, if we are to be consistent, to deal with all the universal expressions of the text in question in the same manner, unless there be some special

and positive reason for doing otherwise. But such positive reasons it seems are wanting, whilst, on the contrary, both Scripture and science afford many motives for believing that the expression "all men" is to be taken in a restricted sense as well as "all flesh" and "all the earth."

It has been said that traditional teaching requires us to believe that the Deluge was universal, at least so far as man is concerned, whatever we may be permitted to hold regarding its extent in other respects. This, however, is scarcely an exact statement of the facts in the case. The general consensus of the Fathers and Doctors does indeed suppose the destruction of all men except Noah and his family. Some exceptions, however, are made which logically open the door to as many more as the advance of science and the demands of exegesis may render necessary.

According to the Septuagint, for instance, Methusalem lived fourteen years after the Deluge. But as he was not one of those in the Ark, some of the Fathers and commentators assume that he must have been saved by other means. Again, Henoch is numbered by some commentators among those who escaped from the waters of the Deluge, and we are told that he was saved because the water did not reach the summit of the mountain where he was sojourning. But, if we can allow two exceptions, why not as many more as the circumstances of the case may require? This, if not a logical necessity, is at least exegetical consistency. To give a restricted meaning to some of the universal terms of the narrative of the Deluge—"all the earth" and "all animals," for instance—and an absolute meaning to others—"all men"—would, as Abbé Motais well observes, be tantamount to employing two systems of weights and measures, and without any scriptural warrant.

And what are the reasons, it may be asked, that make for a change in the opinion that has so long obtained regarding the universal destruction of mankind? They are two-fold—some are biblical, others are scientific.

It would take far more space than we have at our disposal for a complete discussion of the subject, but we may at least

indicate the nature of the argument on which the theory is based.

The first serious objections to a universal destruction of our race came from science. The relics of man found in various parts of Europe and Great Britain—skeletons in caves, flint and stone implements in gravel pits, kitchen utensils in lake dwellings and round about shell deposits—seemed to give man a much greater antiquity than was allowed by the generally-received interpretation of the Mosaic Deluge. These remains seem to evince that men had found their way to very distant parts of the earth at a much earlier period than is usually supposed—at a period certainly long anterior to the Deluge—if we are to rely on the dates ordinarily assigned to the occurrence of this catastrophe. Unless, then, we suppose the Deluge to have occurred much earlier than the majority of chronologists are disposed to concede, we must infer that some of the relics of man found in Europe and Asia, and possibly also in America, are antediluvian, instead of postdiluvian. And if, further, the Deluge affected only a limited portion of territory at most—probably only a small part of Western Asia, as there is now reason to believe—then we are forced irresistibly to the conclusion that there were human beings in various other parts of the world who escaped the inundation described in Genesis.

The conclusions of geology are corroborated by the teachings of archæology, ethnology, physiology and linguistics. Egyptologists and Assyriologists, especially, tell us of races and peoples inhabiting Egypt and parts of Asia who could scarcely have descended from Noah, unless it be assumed that chronologists have been entirely wrong regarding the dates which they have fixed for the Deluge. Full three thousand years B. C. the Egyptians found in the valley of the Nile tribes belonging to the negro race—a race, there is reason to believe, that must have forestalled the Egyptians in the occupation of the country by at least several centuries.[1]

1 See Lenormant's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, Neuvième Edition, Tome II, p. 47, and Maspero's *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient*, Quatrième Edition, p. 17.

And then it is difficult, if not impossible, on any of the known principles of ethnology and physiology, to account for the great difference in color, in anatomical and social characteristics, that distinguish the negro from the Egyptian. It is scarcely reasonable to suppose that such a radical divergence could have occurred in a few years, as we are forced to conclude if we derive both races from Noah. The only alternative, therefore, is to admit that the negroes in Egypt and in other parts of Africa were of antediluvian origin, and that they escaped destruction because the waters of the Flood did not extend to the countries which they inhabited.

History and ethnology likewise tell us of antediluvians found by the descendants of Noah, the Hamites, Semites and Japhetites, along the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, and of an ancient yellow race that the sons of Japhet discovered when they reached the lands watered by the Ganges and the Indus. And this ancient yellow race was preceded by an earlier black, which had been driven to the forests and the mountains when the country was taken possession of by the former.

But, even granting it possible to explain away the difficulties urged by the sciences just mentioned, we are confronted with almost, if not quite, as insuperable objections presented in the name of linguistics. There are, as is known, three great families of languages—the monosyllabic, and the agglutinate, spoken by the yellow, black and red races, and the flexional languages, spoken by the white race, or all those who can be traced with certainty to Noah or his sons. The monosyllabic and agglutinate languages are so entirely unlike the flexional that it is simply impossible to account for their difference, unless we put back the Deluge much further than any system of biblical chronology will warrant, or admit that those who speak monosyllabic and agglutinate tongues belong to pre-Noachic races, and that they all, by reason of their being far away from the land of the Deluge, escaped unharmed.

If we admit what seem to be the logical and incontrovertible deductions of geology, archæology, ethnology,

physiology and linguistics, we remove at once all the difficulties that are urged in the name of these sciences, and find ourselves in a position to reconcile the many discrepancies that have so long puzzled the brains of exegetist and apologist.

Singularly enough, when the results of scientific discovery proclaimed the necessity of revising the interpretations that had been in vogue regarding the total destruction of the race by the Deluge, it was found that there was nothing in the Sacred Text that forbade such a revision. On the contrary, it was found that the narrative of the Deluge might be reconciled with the opinion which excepts a part of the human race from the cataclysm. God, it was said, inspired Moses to write an account of the Deluge. Moses makes use of a written document, or avails himself of an oral tradition which was faithfully preserved among the descendants of the patriarchs. Noah and the members of his family had seen the waters invade all the country which was visible to them, and had witnessed the destruction of all animals and men round about them. They were naturally persuaded, therefore, that all the earth, and that every living thing on its surface, had been submerged. Hence the universal expressions made use of by them in reporting the event: "All flesh," "all things wherein there is breath of life," "all the high mountains under the heaven." Moses had appropriated the documents at hand, and, persuaded of the universality of the Deluge, made no change in the expressions used. The Holy Ghost, having in view only the narrative of a prodigious inundation, destined to punish the crimes of mankind, did not prevent the inspired writer from using these general expressions, inasmuch as these, when compared with similar expressions in other parts of the Bible, were susceptible of a more restricted sense. This restricted sense, applied to the expressions used, would, at a later date, correct the inexact or false idea that had been entertained regarding the extent of the Deluge. "For this reason, then, if the whole question of the non-universality of the Deluge were to be limited to the discussion of the simple text of Moses, there would be in this reasoning a fruitful element of solution."[1]

1 P. Corluy in *La Controverse*, pp. 74–75, May, 1885.

Again, it had all along been assumed, at least by the majority of commentators, that the Deluge was primarily, if not entirely, an act of divine vengeance occasioned by the sins of the world. But the mercy of God, as displayed in the purification of the race; His providence, as manifested in the conservation in all its integrity of the patriarchal line, and, in a still more ineffable manner, in the great work of the Redemption, from which the Deluge may not be disassociated, are factors that are lost sight of in such a circumscribed view of the great catastrophe. "They forget," as Abbé Motais well observes, "the divine idea that embraces both Eden and Golgotha—the promise made in the garden of Paradise, and its fulfillment on the summit of Calvary."

No, the Deluge was not simply an act of divine vengeance; it was rather a means which God, in His wisdom and goodness, employed for preserving intact the patriarchal line from which was to descend the Redeemer of the world; it was a necessity, in order that "the sons of God" might be preserved from contamination by associating with "the daughters of men."

And just here we come upon one of the chief difficulties in the way of a true insight into the providential reasons for the Deluge. What are meant by the expressions "sons of God" and "daughters of men"? Numerous and different interpretations have been given. Many have imagined that by the sons of God are understood the Sethites, and by the daughters of men are designated the Cainites. But a closer examination of the Sacred Text seems to evince that Moses intentionally ignored the Cainites, as he did the descendants of the other children of Adam. He was not concerned with them. They did not enter into the scope of his narrative. His object was to show the genealogy of the patriarchs from Noah through Seth to Adam. After the Deluge he deals only with Noah and the unbroken patriarchal line as descended from him. That there were among the mountains of Central Asia or along the valley of the Nile descendants of Cain and of other children of Adam he may, or may not, have known. But whether he knew of their existence or not—and

we can scarcely believe that he was in ignorance of their existence—it matters not. He was not writing the history of the world. He was tracing out a synopsis of the history of the Hebrew people—the chosen people of the Lord—the sons of God. To him, all who were not Hebrews were "Goim," as, in the estimation of Athenian writers, all who were not Greeks were barbarians. No others entered in the plan of his narrative.

The Cainites had long before emigrated to distant parts of the world. The other descendants of the children of Adam, not mentioned in the ethnographic chart, are absent from the record of the Deluge, because they, too, had long previously sought a home in other far-off lands, and did not, consequently, enter into the purview of the world spoken of by the inspired writer. To Moses, according to Abbé Motais, the patriarchs were the sons of God; the daughters of men were the women of the people who lived in their immediate vicinity. To Moses, the sons of God and the daughters of men were "all men"—the *universi homines*—whose destruction was decreed and carried into execution by the Almighty. All the world was corrupt if the world of the patriarch became tainted. What matters it, from the Messianic point of view, that at the moment of the Incarnation, virginity no longer existed in the world, provided it was still conserved in the heart of Mary? What matters it, from the same point of view, that at the time of the Deluge corruption infected the entire earth, provided that Noah, remaining true patriarch, is able to carry forward the world to Jacob, and through Jacob to Jesus Christ. To effect the object in view it was not necessary to drown the entire race. Moses sees this, and does not, therefore, feel constrained to say it was necessary for God to do that which it was not necessary for Him to do. Viewing the Deluge, then, as affecting only a part of the human race, there is not a single word in the narrative that does not admit of a ready explanation.[1]

And yet more. Such an interpretation throws a flood of light on a number of other passages in Scripture that have

1 Motais, *Le Deluge Biblique*, p. 298.

always been involved in the greatest obscurity. It will suffice for our present purpose to adduce a couple of paragraphs from the celebrated prophecy of Balaam, as recorded in the book of Numbers.

"And when he (the prophet Balaam) saw Amalek, he took up his parable and said: Amalek *the beginning of nations*, whose latter ends shall be destroyed."

"He saw also the *Cainite;* and took up his parable and said; Thy habitation indeed is strong: but though thou build thy nest in a rock, lo! he also, Cain, shall be exterminated."[1]

What are we to understand by the words "Cainites" and "the beginning of the nations?" Leaving aside the various interpretations that have been given by different commentators, is it not clear that, if we accept the theory of the Deluge as just explained, we have here meant the descendants of Cain, who had escaped the great catastrophe—that the prophet refers to an antediluvian race, and that, as compared with the descendants of Noah, who were post-diluvian, they were in very truth *the beginning of nations?*

We might cite other passages from the Old Testament that corroborate this view in the most striking and unexpected manner. We might adduce numerous facts of archaeology that seem to put such an interpretation beyond doubt, but to develop the argument in full would require more space than is here granted us.

From what has been said, it appears probable, if not certain, that the Deluge was universal, neither geographically, zoologically nor ethnographically. What the extent of the Flood was cannot be determined, but it seems to be almost certain that it was very limited, both as to the amount of territory submerged and to the number of the human race destroyed.[2]

1 Numbers xxiv, 20, 21.

2 One of the first to advance the theory of the non-universality of the Deluge, as to man, was Oleaster, a Dominican inquisitor in Portugal, in the sixteenth century. He based his theory on the celebrated prophecy of Balaam. He was followed, in 1656, by La Peyriere in his famous work

The learned Oratorian, Abbé Motais, as the result of a critical and exhaustive examination of the latest conclusions of science and Biblical criticism anent the Noachian Deluge, summarizes his investigations as follows :

"The logic of exegesis, the laws of hermeneutics, the study of parallel passages, and of the personages therein referred to, all keep us within the circle in which the author (Moses) confines himself. Not a word, not an idea, not a reflection obliges us to go outside of it. He is then in perfect accord with the plan and scope of his narrative and of his entire book when, after more than two thousand years of history consecrated solely to the patriarchs, we perceive in the event that is to reform the lineage of the sons of God, an inundation which sweeps away the world of the patriarchs and not the world of humanity.

"And is this saying enough? Is not this conclusion more than permitted by logic? Does not Moses demand it? Do not sound criticism and prudent exegesis require it? All other systems leave the mind uneasy and in suspense. Many

on the *Preadamites*. During the two following centuries the same theory was defended by several other writers of note, especially Cuvier and Quatrefages. In 1853 and 1856 attention was called to it by the works of Klee and Schoebel. In 1866 d' Omalius d' Halloy advocated it in an address delivered before the class of Sciences of the Belgian Academy. In 1869, and subsequently, the theory was developed and strengthened in a remarkable manner by the learned historian and Orientalist, Francois Lénormant. In 1877 Dr. Scholz taught it in the Catholic University of Wurzburg, whilst in 1881, 1882 and 1885 Jean d'Estienne supported it in a series of learned articles in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*. In 1883 it was defended in *La Controverse* by Mgr. Harlez, a professor in the University of Louvain, whilst in the year following it was advocated by M. G. Dubor in the *Muséon*, and by Mgr. Clifford, in the *Tablet*. But, by all odds, the most able and exhaustive work that has yet appeared on the subject is the one which we have so frequently quoted in these pages—*Le Deluge Biblique devant la Foi, l' Ecriture et la Science*, by the late lamented Abbé Motais, of the Oratory at Rennes. We may also refer to *La Non-Universalité du Deluge* and *Encore La Non-Universalité du Deluge* by the Abbé Robert, likewise of the Oratory of Rennes, who strongly champions the theory of his confrère, Abbé Motais, as well as to the masterly *Apologie des Christenthums* by Dr. Schanz, and to the admirable "Scriptural Questions"—Second Series, No. 4—contributed to the *Catholic World* by the erudite Father A. F. Hewit.

objections remain without even a plausible solution. It is necessary to multiply miracles and to have recourse to diverse expedients. But with the exegesis we have indicated, every difficulty disappears, not as the result of multiplied and distinct efforts, but by a single stroke, by the simple admission of the non-universality of the Deluge. This is not a pure hypothesis. It is implicitly revealed in the plan of Genesis; it is explicitly proclaimed in the Pentateuch. The Rationalist is forced to admit it; the believer can accept it without denying any article of dogma. The imperfection and the insufficiency of the older traditional exegesis urge it; its tendencies and principles invite it. What is there, then, to preclude such a view? Only a single word—all—*Omnis;* that *Omnis* which neither the Fathers, nor the Scholastics, nor modern interpreters found to offer any special embarrassment; that *Omnis* which a hundred Scriptural passages show is so often hyperbolic; which even the narrative of the Flood impels us to restrict, and which the design of the author explains always so naturally and so necessarily. No, in truth, we do not find any motives for rejecting a solution at once so simple and comprehensive and so rational.

"Such is the thesis, or, if we wish, such is the hypothesis. Let it be taken up and studied, and contradicted even, but let it not be misrepresented. It is not the product of doubt, but of faith. It is the offspring not of indifference, but of a passionate love of the Scriptures, of a desire to defend and honor them, and of a firm conviction of the truth of their teachings. It has been written with the greatest respect for all the verities of religion as revealed in the Bible, and comes from the heart rather than from the pen. It is not born of the spirit of sect or party; its object is not to give support to the yet doubtful conclusions of profane science. The affirmations and attacks of science have been for us only an incentive to labor, and our study is one which is, before all, and above all one of pure exegesis. That which to our mind is most forcible and most convincing are arguments which are purely and simply biblical. He who adheres to the plan of Genesis as formulated by Moses, is on solid

ground. This is the true citadel. Unless driven from this, no one can ever, unless the Church speaks, justly refuse to a Catholic the liberty to reject in the name of Moses himself, the total destruction of humanity by the Deluge. It is this right to liberty, we repeat in conclusion, that we have above all things wished to establish. In defending this hypothesis we have carefully measured our words and weighed our motives, and have all along had before our eyes the difficulties of other systems before which so many minds recoil. Let others judge of the value of these two motives, but let us be allowed to think that they are such as are justified by the severest and most exact exegesis.

"If criticism ratifies this thesis it will have—and this is something in its favor— the honor of being established, not under the guarantee of profane science, nor in consequence of some hostile discovery, but as the result of a free and respectful effort of Catholic exegesis. It cannot, then, be said that it is reason that dispossesses faith. Rather must it be affirmed that it is faith that perfects belief, since it is Moses who explains himself by what he has written.

"Those who may reject the thesis, if such there should be, cannot, at least, refuse it the merit of being produced under the dominion of great and holy preoccupations, since its aim and purport are to remove objections urged against Catholic faith, to tranquilize souls and to reassure consciences. Neither can any one deny that it is calculated to yield happy results. It makes God equally great, in showing Him more benign, and the lesson it inculcates, being, as it is, less marked with the impress of vengeance, is also salutary. It exhibits, better than any other theory, and in a brighter light, the lofty destiny of Israel ; the genealogical union—by some perfidiously denied—of the Synagogue and the Church ; the continued and merciful action of God toward the world, in order to bring it to the Messiah. It places beyond all attack the grand dogma of Adamic descent. It reveals the majestic unity of the plan of Genesis, and affords a solid support to the authenticity of the Divine Book. Finally, it gives Catholic exegesis the advantage of acting on the offen-

sive, against the prejudices of a Rationalism which perversely avails itself of the imperfect information of its opponents, and of the exaggerated opinions which they maintain, rather through apathetic confidence than from enlightened respect for the Book of books."[1]

No better illustration than the subject we have been discussing could be instanced of the perfect liberty of opinion, in matters not of faith, which the Church permits her children. More than this. Not only does she grant us the greatest liberty of thought, but she also encourages us to add to her riches by appropriating the treasures of the Egyptians. Has not Leo XIII, in his admirable encyclical of February 15, 1882, exhorted us to make use of the discoveries of modern science, and does he not declare, in a few words, in his letter throwing open the treasures of the Vatican to the scholars of the world, what is the spirit which should animate every honest investigator and champion of science? The Church does not fear the truth. She cannot abet what is false.[2]

And let no one imagine that such liberty of opinion, such freedom of discussion, are calculated to foster rationalism and skepticism. The very opposite is the case. Has not Renan, in his *Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse*,[3] told us that what he took as the Catholic teaching regarding the Deluge was one of the prime causes of his infidelity? And have not many others, in a similar manner, suffered the pangs of doubt, if not the loss of faith, in consequence of mistaking the opinions of the Fathers and Doctors in matters of science and philosophy for the dogmatic definitions of the Church? And have not others, again, forged intellectual fetters for themselves in consequence of the erroneous notions they entertained regarding the sense of the Church—the *Intellectus Catholicus*—which, far from impeding their researches in the domain of science, is as broad and as liberal as Truth itself?

1 *La Deluge Biblique*, p. 339 et seq.

2 The memorable words of the illustrious Pontiff are: "*Ne quid falsi audeat; ne quid veri non audeat.*"

3 P. 293.

There is such a thing as misguided zeal for the integrity of the Scriptures—a misleading reverence for the authority of traditional and scholastic teaching. It will not do to interpret the Sacred Text under the influence of preconceived notions, especially when such notions have no positive scriptural warrant. Neither will it do to attribute greater weight to the teachings of the Fathers and the Schoolmen than these eminent doctors of the Church intended they should have. If St. Augustine, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Jerome, St. Thomas Aquinas or Albertus Magnus had before them all the facts disclosed by modern science, would they have expressed themselves on many questions as they did? We do them a great wrong to suppose for a moment that they would. If they were living now, can we have any doubt about the character of their teaching? Surely not. It would be absurd to suppose that the keenest and the most comprehensive and the most liberal minds the world has ever known would feel that they were committed to views that had been expressed when most of the data necessary for a proper understanding of the subjects discussed were entirely wanting. Such an assumption, aside from being an injustice to them, would be an exhbition of egotism on our part that would be simply intolerable.

To find fault with them for having, one or two thousand years ago, a less extensive knowledge of the natural and physical sciences than we ourselves possess, would be simply preposterous.[1] As well might it be affirmed that we should now know as much about the inductive sciences as will our

1 A fair sample of this irrational way of considering the opinions of the earlier commentators is afforded by Andrew D. White, in his "Warfare of Science," and in his "New Chapters on the Warfare of Science," published in the *Popular Science Monthly*. A striking instance of *ignoratio elenchi*, or of *suppressio veri*, regarding the subject here discussed is seen in two articles, by Prof. Huxley, in the *Nineteenth Century* reprinted in his latest work "Some Controverted Questions," in "Lights of the Church and Light of Science," and "Hasisadra's Adventure." Prof. Huxley is a great biologist; but in these two articles he has conspicuously demonstrated his ability to outdo Don Quixote in his onslaught on windmills.

successors ten or twenty centuries hence. Such an admission would be tantamount to asserting that the sum total of natural knowledge is independent of research; that the natural and physical sciences are not progressive in their nature, that, contrary to the very nature of these sciences—based, as they are, on the observation of facts and phenomena—they are incapable of development. It is obvious that no sane mind can hold, much less defend, such a view. We must judge the Fathers and Doctors of the Church as we ourselves, under similar circumstances, would wish to be judged. We must view their opinions on the "obscure things of Nature," as they themselves, in the light of our present knowledge, would view them.

St. Augustine in referring to this subject speaks with his usual clearness and prudence. "There are many men," he says, "who are strangers to our holy religion, who have an extensive acquaintance with the profane sciences. What will they say when they hear a Christian who, when speaking of these things according to notions which he pretends to have derived from the Scriptures, gives expression to the grossest and most ridiculous extravagances? It is a shame and a scandal which can on no account be tolerated. That a Christian should make himself the butt of ridicule is of no great consequence, but the evil is that our sacred writers become responsible for his stupid views in the eyes of unbelievers who accuse them of ignorance, and despise them, to the detriment of souls whose salvation should be our special concern. When they see a Christian falling into grave errors in matters which they understand so well, and making our Sacred Books responsible for his foolish imaginings, how can they admit as true that which the same books teach regarding the resurrection of the dead, the hope of eternal life and the kingdom of heaven, when they fancy that they find them teaching what is false concerning questions of which they know the truth either from their own experiences, or from reasons that are incontestable."[1]

The Angelic Doctor, who quotes with approval these

1 De Genesi ad Lit., Lib. 1, Cap. xix.

words of St. Augustine, is not less explicit in the statement of similar views. "As for myself," he declares, "I find that the safest way regarding those opinions held by the generality of philosophers, and reconcilable with our faith, is not to affirm them as dogmas . . . and not to reject them as contrary to faith for fear of affording the wise ones of the world an occasion to contemn the teachings of religion."[1]

In weighing the opinions of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, we must always carefully distinguish the object of faith from the motives on which it is based. Errors in physics, zoology, history, criticism, exegesis, do not impair the authority or the magisterium of the Fathers and Doctors when speaking in their capacity of witnesses to tradition and of the common faith of the Church. We may not, indeed, without new and weighty reasons—*novæ rationis pondere*, as Pallavicini expresses it—reject the teachings of such venerable authorities in questions like the one now under discussion, but when sufficiently grave reasons are forthcoming, we may safely, and without incurring the note of rashness—*temeritatis nota*—modify our opinions so as to make them harmonize with the certain data and conclusions of science.

J. A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

NOTE.—By an oversight the name of the Abbé Moigno was inserted in note 3, page 21, of the January number of the REVIEW, as belonging to the number of those who taught that the Deluge affected only a portion of the earth's surface. As is well known, the learned Abbé defended to the day of his death the geographical universality of the Deluge. On page 24, at the end of the second paragraph, the word *invisible* is used for *visible*.

1 *Opusc.* ix.

THE OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS.

I.

AT all times, from the beginning of the world, God has had His chosen servants among men—souls lifted up high above the common level and enriched with the characteristic gifts of holiness—saints in the true sense of the word. Yet, when we talk of the saints, our thoughts scarce ever go back beyond the Christian ages, as if the highest virtues had been unknown to the world before the coming of Christ.

It has not been always so. In the first ages of the Church, the great characters of the Old Testament were constantly turned to for inspiration. The traditional admiration and reverence of the Jewish people for their patriarchs and their prophets became from the beginning, and for obvious reasons, a part of the devotion of Christians. Many of them, converts from Judaism, had learned it from their youth, and brought it with them into the Church. Others imbibed it from the devotional reading of the Sacred Books, about the only ones available for purposes of edification in these early times. To all it was made familiar by the custom which prevailed almost from the beginning, of introducing lengthened passages from the Old as well as from the New Testament into the liturgical celebration. The facts and personages of the ancient dispensation, thus ever kept before the minds of the faithful, became in turn the subjects of the oral instructions imparted to them. Most of the commentaries on Scripture left us by the Fathers were delivered in the shape of homiletic instructions, and it is easy to see how they delighted to dwell on the examples of virtue preserved in the Old Testament narrative. Each one of the patriarchs became the model of some special virtue—Abraham of faith, Isaac of simplicity, Jacob of courage and perseverance, Joseph of charity, and so on with the others. To a young man who begged to be taught the way of a perfect life, St. Gregory of Nyssa replies by writing a life of Moses, whom he presents as one who carried perfection as far as human nature would permit. In the same strain we possess several books of St. Ambrose on the patriarchs, of

St. Gregory on Job, in the shape of a commentary on the inspired poem which bears his name; indeed all through the moral and ascetic writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers the praises of the prophets and heroes of the Old Testament are to be found side by side with those of the Christian martyrs.

But in the Eastern Churches a still higher honor was paid to them. Special anniversary days were set apart to celebrate their memory. The sacrifice was offered and panegyrics pronounced in their honor, in the same manner as for the saints of the New Law. "Who were the Macchabees," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, at the very opening of his eleventh oration, "for on this day we celebrate their feast."

In the Menologium of the Greek Church, the saints of the Old Law are registered with those of the New. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, Samuel, David, all the prophets, besides many more, have their days assigned to them, and the same is noticeable in the Kalendaria of the Armenians, the Copts and the other Oriental Churches.[1]

There was a special reason for such a devotion developing in the East, where the holy personages of the Old Testament had lived, and where memorials of many of them continued to be shown.

1 The Greek Menologium will be found in the 117th Vol. of Migne's *Patres Graeci*. A short notice of each saint is given, as also of the event considered deserving of special commemoration, such as the apparition of the cross to Constantine—a shower of ashes which fell at Constantinople one year on the 7th of November, causing universal terror—also a mysterious emission of ashes from the tomb in which St. John the Evangelist laid himself down as if in death (according to the Greek tradition he never died, but shared the privilege of Enoch and Elias), the ashes issuing forth every year on the 7th of May and healing all the sick to whom they were applied. This same belief finds expression in the Coptic Kalendaria, published by Assemani, (Catal. MSS. Flor.) *Translatio St. Joannis Evangelistae.* Other commemorations of rather an unexpected character occur there, such as: *Commem. St. Annae prophetissae, matris Samuelis;—Commem. Samsonis ex Judicibus Israel;* others again indicative of more piety than enlightenment—*Commem. viginti quatuor seniorum in circuitu sedis Dei super thronum sedentis; Festum quatuor animalium quorum meminit Apocalypsis; Memoria primae missae quam Salvator noster cum suis apostolis in Coscan Egypti oppido celebravit; caedes sanctorum quadraginta quatuor millium infantium in Bethlehem; Mem. terribilis Eclipsis, etc.*

It never went far in the Latin Church. Most indeed of the Old Testament names, inscribed in the Eastern calendars, made their way into the Roman martyrology, but beyond this imperfect recognition, no public homage was paid to them.

An exception, however, was made from the beginning in favor of St. John the Baptist, because in a true sense, he might be numbered among the followers of Christ and considered as belonging to the new dispensation; but more still because of the high place assigned to him by the Saviour Himself "there hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist." A similar favor was extended at an early date to the Holy Innocents as we see by the many homilies pronounced in their honor by the Latin as well as by the Greek Fathers. Finally in both Churches the memory of the Macchabees was solemnly kept, the exception having its origin doubtless in the striking resemblance of their sufferings for their faith with those of the Christian martyrs (V. S. Bernard. Ep. 98). For many centuries the Latin Church declined to go beyond those narrow limits. The feast of St. Anne, mother of the Blessed Virgin was slow to take root even in the Oriental Churches, and was formally adopted in the West only toward the close of the sixteenth century (1584). That of St. Joachim offered still more difficulty. Introduced originally into the Roman liturgy by Julius II in 1850, it was set aside by St. Pius V in his reformed edition of the breviary, timidly re-admitted by Gregory XIII some years later, and finally sanctioned only in 1622, by Gregory XV. It is remarkable that in this liturgy of ours no special honors are assigned to several of the most conspicuous and venerable personages of the Gospel, such as St. Simeon and St. Anne, who took so beautiful and touching a share in the Presentation of our Lord in the Temple, or to the blessed parents of St. John the Baptist, Zachary and Elizabeth, both objects of divine favor and enriched with the gift of prophecy. Even St. Joseph, so closely connected with the person of our Lord and who now stands so high in the worship of the Church had

his claims allowed but very late, for although popular devotion to him was steadily growing through the latter part of the Middle Ages, it is only in the sixteenth or seventeenth century that his feast becomes one of general public celebration.

All this shows how reluctant the Roman Church has been at all times to extend to the saints of the Old Law the honors paid to those of the New. And the reason seems to be that, although the former, as the Fathers remark, were initially Christians, believing obscurely in the coming Redeemer, sharing by anticipation in the grace of His coming, and, by their heroic devotion to truth and righteousness, showing, says St. Gregory Nazianzen, what they would have done for Christ, if it had been given them to know Him, yet they belonged only to a preparatory dispensation; a noble yet unsubstantial shadow of what was to come, and their *dies natalis* could not be made a day of rejoicing for it opened not to them, as to the Christian saints, the immediate possession of eternal bliss.

And then the number of the latter was ever on the increase, their power of protection and intercession was more widely felt and led the faithful to concentrate their devotion on them; their examples, finally, as belonging entirely to the Christian form of life, were much better suited to be proposed to the imitation of the faithful. The Fathers, it is true, had held up the Old Testament saints as perfect patterns of Christian virtues; but at the same time they projected into them an abundance of the spirit of the Gospel, greater, perhaps, than strict historical accuracy would have allowed. Futhermore, they had to keep carefully out of sight, or to drown in allegorical commentary many features of these religious heroes of ancient times which would hardly have brought edification to the Christian mind, if fully perceived, and which, at the same time, could with difficulty remain entirely unnoticed.

All this made it much easier to fix the attention and the devotion of the faithful on the Christian saints, and the remark applies with especial force to these later ages, more

deeply imbued with the historical spirit, and less ready to gather edification from purely conventional pictures of the events or of the men of the past. In sacred as well as in secular history, we want nowadays to know things as they happened and see people as they lived and moved.

Let us strive to look at them in this way. The holy men and women of the old dispensation, though different perhaps in many ways from what we were wont to imagine them, will lose nothing thereby of their attractiveness or of their power to edify.

The character of many of them, as seen in the sacred narrative, is extremely beautiful. The life of Abraham, for instance, from the time he leaves his Chaldean home, in response to the call of God, until he dies in the fullness of years, and is laid by his two sons with Sara in the cave of Mambre, is an ideal picture of nobleness and goodness. With his fellow-men the pariarch is ever high-minded, yet gentle, helpful, free from attachment to earthly advantages; leaving his choice of places to Lot, and suffering him to take what was best; declining the spoils of the victory which he had helped to win; insisting with a delicacy of tact worthy of the most refined civilization, on paying full price for the resting place offered him as a free gift. His relations with God are equally beautiful and touching. On his side there is simple faith, boundless trust, entire devotion. He lives under the divine guidance, waiting on God, leaning on Him, looking to Him in all things, wherever he goes his first concern is to erect an altar. "And Abraham passed into Sichem, and there built he an altar to Jehovah . . . and he moved to a mount on the east of Bethel, and there he built an altar and called upon the name of the Lord," and he returns in his wandering life to offer sacrifice there again; and when he settles down in the valley of Mambre, again, "He built an altar to the Lord." In return God blesses him with wealth, and is ever near at hand to protect him. In response to his prayer for posterity He calls him out from under his tent and tells him to look up to heaven—into the depths of the midnight sky glittering with innumerable stars. "Look toward heaven

and number the stars if thou canst ; so shall thy seed be." As a picture of deeply reverent, yet free and loving intercourse of man with God, and of paternal love and care of God for man, in history or fiction there is nothing more perfect.

What, again, is more exquisitely gentle and loving than Joseph? From beginning to end we find not in him a trace of bitterness or resentment. Even when "the iron entered his soul," he complained not. He is content to love, yet not to be loved, to save, yet to be forgotten. He has no words of reproach for his guilty brethren; he actually takes the sting out of their shame and remorse by telling them it was the work of God. Well has he deserved to be praised by the Fathers as being, no less by his Christlike virtues of purity and charity, than by the particulars of his eventful life, the most perfect prototype of the Redeemer.

It would be easy to continue the list : Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, and many others, known only in outline, offer traits of singular beauty on which Christian souls have always dwelt with edification and delight. From them and from so many more of whom we have only incidental notices or casual deeds, but who bear in the sacred narrative the stamp of divine approval, we may easily gather the essential conception of moral perfection and holiness which prevailed under the Old Covenant. Indeed, the whole literature of the Old Testament, ever concerned with the moral and religious aspect of human wants, and human actions, gives us a very distinct and full impression of what men were expected to be when at their best—"Just, upright and fearing God."

(To be continued.)

J. HOGAN.

THE SHEPHERD KING.

A JUBILEE ODE.

I.

To thee, O Triple-crowned, my heart would raise
From the far silence of the West
A song of praise:
No Sabbath-hymn of rest,
Though this were surely best
For the worn soldier, weary of the frays!
Conquerer, Thou, and crowned with wreathing bays,
Yet warring still: For while the battle-blaze
Gleams to the midnight-noon, thy fearless breast
Still hearkeneth war's behest!

II.

So in my soul the battle-music sings:
The many-echoing trump I hear;
The roll of drums is in mine ear;
Until the leaping fancy brings
The battle near.
How shall my hand essay the strings
Deadened with wont of peaceful things?
I dream of war—their murmurings
Whisper of quiet woods, of waters clear,
Or of the darkling brook, or moonlit mere!

III.

O Man of Peace, whose lips were framed to bless,
No fatal glory lures thine eyes
To earthly victories:
Thy hand hath loved not the caress
Of battle's wretchedness:
The foes that 'round thee press
With jeers and hell-born cries,
Do war against the everlasting skies!
Pastoral staff and shepherd's dress
Thy peace and love confess.

Not thine the choice, nor thine the glory less,
SOLDIER OF GOD, still battling for the prize
In war's disguise.

IV.

Full is the theme of strife ; and yet the strings
Swell to no blast of battle. The dull breeze
Blown from the fields of peace, still idly clings
To the loose-stringèd lyre. The voice of trees
I hear, of rocks and streams, of birds and bees.
The summer-chalice drunken to the lees
Robs this fierce winter of its stings
And cheats the dreaming ear to quiet jubilees !

V.

Nor is the singer wrong
The choral joys among
To pipe a pastoral song !
Thou, too, has touched the tender chords,
Not to the clash of hostile swords,
Not to the strife and Babel-din
That close thy visible being in,
But to the chants of peace. Thy tongue
In classic numbers doth prolong
What melody to olden singers gave
No unremembered grave.
In vain the listening ear
Waiteth the bugle blast to hear—
Thy fingers rather touch with conscious will
The oaten stop of joyous Lycidas
Pressing the velvet couch of upland grass,
Chiding his Thyrsis who will still prolong
The endless melancholy of his song :
Anon Thou sweep'st the Orphean lyre
That hushed the very birds, until
The trees and rocks and every hill
Did leave their rooted base to listen nigher,
Yea, and the streams stood still,
Drinking the endless draughts of godlike fire !

VI.

Like David, warring still for God,
Thou rather lov'st the quiet sod
The foot of boyhood oft hath trod :
Like him, a KING thou art,
Ruling an Israel
Greater than tongue may tell,—
Ruling with pastoral staff and not with iron rod !
And so thy shepherd's heart,
Like David's, strong to meet the foe,
Doth rather urge the call the sheep may know.

VII.

The Shepherd-King of Juda's Race
Tuned to a hundred themes his lyre :
Oft had he met them face to face,
Philistine giants, clothed with fierce desire.
Nor spear, nor sword, nor ponderous mace,
Writing their tale in many a careworn trace,
Fretted his martial soul with threats of vengeance dire.
Shouts of the captains, roarings of the chase
Found in his heart a place !
And yet, how best the hymns of heavenly grace
Beat his fine frenzy into shafts of fire !

VIII.

Anon, the hymns of praise between,
Softly his numbers run
To boyish reveries won
By the still waters, or in pastures green.
The golden sceptre and the glancing sheen
Of regal vestments cannot wean
This child of Nature from her swelling breast
Where he hath loved to rest
And deeply drink the secret of the power
That buildeth strength in wheat and splendor in the flower.
To pride and pomp his strings are mute,
But echo back the pastoral flute.

Lo! from his eyes the visible scene
Fades like a dream of night
Before the coming light!
Again he strays with careless mien
Where Ruth of old had come to glean
The alien harvest; where the herded flocks
Fed in the dewy grass; the curdled rocks
Tumbled their endless crests where Moab lies
Hid in the shadows of the sunset skies.
The meadowy uplands stretching from his feet
Till the far ridge and southern heavens meet,
Philistia's pastures, and beyond, the Sea—
These were the nurses of his melody!
So, if the torrent-tide of song will roll
From lips that burst with praise or droop with dole,
Ceaseless to God, the Shepherd of his soul—
The bosoming wady, and the silence cool
Brooding at noontide o'er the latticed pool
Where still the shepherds keep
Dear watch and ward over the straying sheep,
These to the Royal Singer themes afford
Of tender trust and comfort in the Lord,
Who o'er His faithful sheep still keepeth watch and ward.

IX.

So would I sing
Of thee, O Shepherd-King,
Leo the Warrior, crowned with triumphing!
Though in thine ear still sounds the horrid roar
Of many-throated war,
And hosts of hell their long defiance fling
At Heaven's door!
Joyful I raise
The chant of praise,
Not merely for thy wondrous length of days,
But for the shepherd-strength that nerves thy arm
To shield thy flock from harm,
And for the shepherd lips that will not cease
To sing the song of peace!

The past is thine and God's ; the present lies
Pregnant with doubt and awful mysteries
Till earth shall wed the daylight of the skies !
Yet with unflinching heart of destiny,
Heed not the moanings of the unknown sea :
Still from the quenchless fount of youth
Drink deep its beauty and its truth.

X.

Ah me ! the battle is not o'er,
Nor shall be until Time shall be no more !
Still, still the serpent's sting
Prolongs the suffering ;
And man, who was a god before,
Deep in the dust is groveling ;
Or, rising, still essays to soar,
Only on leaden wing.
The world hath grown too wise :
Oh ! could it see with childhood's eyes,
Undimmed with sin and shame,
Where best of glory lies,
No hearts of men but should their fierceness tame
At sound of thy blest name !
Sweet Shepherd, lead them still with patient rod,
Till shades of night
Cover thy sight,
Unto eternal pastures and to God !

H. T. HENRY.

THE "INVITATORY" OF THE ROMAN OFFICE.

THE XCIVth Psalm, which the Hour of Matins in the Roman Office begins, is one of the oldest portions of the Breviary in its present form. Hence the peculiarity of its Latin text which will be found to differ somewhat from that of the same psalm in the third Nocturn of the Epiphany

Office. The latter is taken from the version which St. Jerome made after the revision of the old Itala had been introduced into the Liturgy of the Roman Church, and St. Damasus preferred to let the less perfect version stand rather than disturb the manner of public devotion which had become sacred by custom. The old Itala text of this psalm has been preserved also in the Roman Pontifical (dedication of a church) and in the Tracts and Responses of the Missal, thus witnessing to the antiquity of the Catholic Liturgy, while the newer and more accurate version of this psalm has been incorporated in the Vulgate edition of the Bible and in the later offices of the Breviary.

To the devout Hebrew the words of this psalm were familiar as a Sabbath song, and we find St. Paul in his letter to the Hebrews quote the larger portion of it, as if it constituted a special title of appeal to their conviction. (Heb. iii. 7-11 and iv. 3. 5, 7.) Some doubt has been cast upon its authorship because the Masorah does not mention any name in its title; but we may believe that the authority of the Septuagint, which is in this case confirmed by the express testimony of St. Paul in the above cited letter, is sufficient evidence of the Davidic origin of the psalm. The occasion on which it was composed is generally believed to have been that of the solemn transportation of the Ark of the Covenant from Gaba to the house of Obededon. Theodoret thinks that the royal prophet had at this time a foresight of the happy reign of King Josiah whose piety and zeal were to restore—at least for a time—the ancient worship of the Jewish temple.

The liturgical character of the psalm can hardly be mistaken. It has the manner of a processional hymn, consisting, in the original Hebrew, of five strophes, each having two verses in heptasyllabic meter. There are two distinct motives running through the whole song. The first part, as far as the eighth verse, is *eucharistic* in its character. It invites the faithful to the common praises of God, and assigns the reasons for doing so. "Come, Let us praise the Lord with joy (1–3), for He is master of all things created (4–5); let us adore Him" (6-7). The second half of the

psalm is *parenetic*, that is to say, it conveys a warning. "This day harden not your hearts against the appeal of the Lord (8–9), but remember how your fathers were punished for their revolt in the desert" (10–11).

As the psalm was chanted in the synagogue on each Sabbath, so the Christian converts from Judaism continued to sing it in their assemblies of prayer until it gradually became an integral portion of the Catholic liturgy. In the monastic institutions it was perpetuated as part of the daily devotion. The monk who kept vigil aroused his brethren at midnight to the celebration of matins with the words "Venite Adoremus." Each in his cell responded to the call by repeating the salutation, as is still the custom in religious communities of the Catholic Church. After a time the Abbot intoned the psalm with the same or similar words, and the full chorus of devout recluses joined in the chant. The tones varied according to the solemnity of the feast.

To many of the monks the different modes of the psalmody had been familiar from their childhood; indeed, if P. Martini's testimony is right, the eight tones of the ecclesiastical chant may be traced back to the Levitic service of the Jewish temple at Jerusalem whence SS. Peter and Mark brought it to Rome and Alexandria. "They were the chants of the synagogue from which the first Christians came. Hence they were the very chants in which our Lord and His Apostles, in which Mary and her companions must have sung them." (Ullathorne, *Letters*, p. 174.)

The twofold sentiment of praise and warning woven into the hymn, make of this psalm that peculiar form of prayer and exhortation which adapts itself perfectly to the priestly office. The shepherd calls his flock in tones which must awaken in his own heart the consciousness of the sublimity of his functions and of the weight of his responsibility. *Venite*—come to the sacrifice of praise and joy in the Lord; *praeoccupemus faciem ejus*—let us walk in His presence, for He is great above all the gods (idols) which our fancy and vanity causes us to fashion; we are His people, the chosen

ones of His flock whom His hand carries,—*nos populus pascuae ejus et oves manus ejus.*

In the next place the psalmist bids us take warning lest we reject or neglect the graces offered at the present time (hodie) for our sanctification. He speaks of provocation and temptation (*sicut in exacerbatione secundum diem tentationis in deserto*). What were the occasions which provoked the anger of the Lord, and the very recollection of which caused every Hebrew to tremble with the fear of chastisement? One was the gathering of the murmuring Israelites at Raphidim when they threatened the life of Moses because water began to fail in their camp (Exod. xvii. 1–7); the other was the sedition at Cades in the desert of Sin, when, for a similar cause, they revolted against Moses and Aaron (Num. xx, 2--13). The want of trust in Jehovah, the revolt against their divinely appointed leaders despite their heavenly power which the whole people had witnessed before, brought upon them the anger of the Lord so that none of them was to see the land of Chana or to receive the reward which Jehovah had promised to those of His people who should prove faithful to Him and His servant Moses.

This event gives a prophetic character to the present psalm in the mouth of the Christian priest. The Jews who had proved unmindful of their covenant were to perish without becoming partakers in the Messianic promise. To the Christian, and in an especial manner to the priest, the constant evidence of God's providence in behalf of His people becomes a deadly threat. Man, in proportion as he consciously ignores the voice of God in nature and in the evidences of the Christian religion is to lose for a certainty the eternal inheritance of Heaven. The greater his knowledge of the divine law, the surer his ruin if he be deaf to the call of daily renewed admonition. So sure is this that the Lord confirms it with an oath "*quibus juravi in ira mea*—si introibunt in requiem meam," that is, "they shall surely not enter into my rest because I have sworn it."

From a devotional point of view, the psalm contains the elements most of all others adapted to raise the heart to an

attitude of humble yet joyous adoration ; and this elevation is sustained, both by the ejaculatory form which repeats itself in the psalm, as also by the suggestion on the one hand of holy fear, and, on the other, of assured protection. From the very opening a tone of sympathy communicates itself to the one who recites it by the fact that he finds himself calling on his brethren throughout the world to join in this canticle of praise and reverence.

This fact gives greater efficacy to the prayer itself. If the union of two or three devoutly gathered, even in spirit, has the power of drawing into their midst the Lord of heaven, how much stronger does this bond of union become in the multiplied charity of many hearts whose dwelling-place is the Holy Ghost. And the *Invitatory* has, in sooth, no other meaning than to recall the reciting priest to the consciousness that he is officiating as vicar of Christ, presenting the united prayer of the Church, militant and suffering, to the Eternal Father. Thousands of Christians under the care of a common pastor can do no more than lift their hearts with good intention in the morning, to God, and then for the full day, until the night closes their weary eyes, they hold their faces bent, through necessity or habit, upon the earth. One only watches—their pastor. He is appointed and ordained the watchman of the flock, high above them, keeping guard over those far and near. "Upon thy walls O Jerusalem I have appointed watchmen ; all the day and all the night they shall never hold their peace. You that are mindful of the Lord hold not your peace and give Him no silence till He establishes and till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth" (Is. lxii, 6-7).

Joy, too, is the keynote of efficient prayer. Everywhere the prophet reminds us of the fact that favors of the Lord come to those who keep alive holy joy. Joy is an evidence of confidence. The child that loves its father bears the expression of its happiness on its face and in its voice and gesture. The saints tell us that joy is caused by sacrifice—and this must be because sacrifice feeds our love, and love begets confidence, and confidence brightens into joy. Thus

"CIRCUIT ADVERSARIUS VESTER DIABOLUS."

Canonicas horas, si devote legis, oras.
Tunc orantur horae si corde leguntur et ore:
Littera neglecta, vel syllaba murmure tecta,
Colligit haec sathanas, sinon cum corde laboras
Fragmina verborum Tytinillus colligit horum.
Quaque die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille
Quid facis extra chorum, qui debitor officiorum
Es divinorum? Cur induis acta vagorum?
Desine stare foras, quia Christus ponderat horas
Et nominando moras, distinguit qualiter oras.
Qui psalmos resecat, vel verba Davidica curtat,
Displicet ille Deo, dum placuisse putat.
Cum Domino psalles, psallendo tu tria serves:
Dirige cor sursum, profer bene, respice sensum;
Nunc lege, nunc ora, nunc cum fervore labora.

the "Exultate" and "Jubilate" of the Invitatory psalm have a power to awaken in us both confidence and love whose echoes they are :

> Eja alacres cuncti Domini celebremus honores :
> Salute parta Domino agamus gratias.

Thus, in taking up the Breviary, we are reminded, from the first, of our priestly commission to prepare the way by a joyous invitation to all mankind to join us in the praises of the Lord. "Go, go through the gates, prepare the way for the people, make the road plain." (Is. l. c. 10.) And as the sound of music stirs our courage to lead on in the procession toward the Mount of David, we fix our gaze on high by that spontaneous movement which accompanies every inspiration from above. *Praeoccupemus faciem ejus*—the eye of the Lord meets our gaze, and from that wondrous source of light and intelligence we derive wisdom—such wisdom as earthly knowledge can never give, *sapientia desursum, pudica, pacifica;* and they who are ruled by it do all things well, "qui autem agunt omnia cum consilio, reguntur sapientia (Prov. xiii, 10); for " the Lord has set His eye upon their hearts to show them the greatness of His works ; that they might praise the name which He has sanctified." (Eccl. xvii, 6.)

If such is, in general, the fruit of the devout recitation of the Office, it is not to be forgotten that the *Invitatory* has for its special purpose to put us into the proper attitude of mind and heart. A good beginning is, in this case, more than the work of devotion half accomplished.

The antiphon inserted between the different verses of the psalm has for its object to point the application of the sentiments of joy, gratitude, and holy fear. Each mystery of faith, or the remembrance of the holy lives of Apostle, Martyr, Confessor, or Virgin, readily fits itself as an accompanying sentiment to the thought : *Venite exultemus Domino, jubilemus Deo salutari nostro, praeoccupemus faciem ejus in confessione et in psalmis jubilemus ei.* But of the antiphons we must speak at another time.

P. ARMINIO.

WHAT SHALL WE SING?

EXPERIENCE OF AN OLD MISSIONARY.

PERCHANCE some readers of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW will disagree with the views expressed in the following paper on Church music. They may say that the time has come for the Bishop of Burlington to remain silent. But the title I have chosen for my essay might serve to shield me from untoward censure. I am indeed so old that my age itself is a warrant for the claim that I have heard as much bad and as much good singing in churches, as the greater number of our prelates and clergy; and in touching on this subject of church-music I shall endeavor to write more like a Bishop than like an artist.

Some time ago I published for the use of my clergy *Rules and Recommendations regarding Church music, in the diocese of Burlington, Vt.* These "Rules and Recommendations" may prove useful to others as well, and my principal object here is to state some of the reasons which have induced me to define the methods which are to be observed in reference to this subject for my own diocese.

In the first place it will be admitted as desirable to eliminate from the divine service the objectionable and unauthorized manner of chanting which has obtained in many places, especially at Mass. Hence I have insisted that no Mass should be sung in which the chanters assume the part of the celebrant by singing the words *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* and *Credo in unum Deum.* In like manner the *Deo gratias* after the Epistle, the *Laus tibi Christi* after the Gospel, and the *Veni Creator* before the sermon are not to be chanted, because there is, to my knowledge, no *rubric* authorizing any of these practices.

Masses not expressly approved by a Bishop or not contained in a properly authorized manual of Church music I have absolutely prohibited. Nor will anyone, whose experience has led him to give thought to the subject, undervalue the importance of such a restriction.

We see continually announcements of new Masses which

are lauded as *chef d'oeuvres* of harmony; yet in many instances the would-be celebrated composers do not know the sense of the Latin words which they set to music. They seem to be devoid of all proper devotional sentiments, and frequently scruple not to cut out words, nay entire sentences, of the Liturgy, or to change them; and this, simply, to suit their musical fancy. They are bent upon giving us some music which they consider pleasing to the ear. For such reasons it is but just, and indeed required by the devotional purpose of the liturgical music, that, before a piece is introduced into the divine service, it should have the approval of the proper diocesan authority, which is, in the first instance, the Bishop, who may appoint a committee, properly qualified, to examine whether the style of composition is suitable for the solemn functions of the Church and whether the correctness of Catholic doctrine has not been marred by the freedom of the musician.

FROM WHAT BOOKS SHALL WE SING?

There are three different classes of persons who are to participate in the liturgical chant of the High or Solemn Mass.

1.—The priest. His book is the missal, which contains all that he has to sing, with the proper notation or melody for each part. In the missal the celebrant finds the notes for the *Gloria in excelsis*, the *Credo in unum Deum*, the *Preface*, the *Pater noster*, each according to the rank of the peculiar festival which is being celebrated; also the *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*, the *Ite missa est.* Elsewhere (ex. gr. in the Ceremonial of Baltimore) we find directions for singing the *Dominus vobiscum*, the *Epistle* and *Gospel.* The observance of these directions is of obligation, and it is simple presumption to suppose that our fancy could improve them. The music of the Church, when properly understood, and accordingly executed, is most beautiful and touches the devout hearer to tears.

2.—In all well organized churches there ought to be regular chanters able to sing at the High Mass the *Introit*,

Gradual, *Sequence*, *Offertory*, and *Postcommunion*, which vary nearly every Sunday and holiday. These chanters should likewise lead the congregation in the singing of the *Ordinary of the Mass*. We shall presently indicate the books whence these portions of the liturgical chant are to be taken.

3.—The portions to be sung by the congregation are the *Kyrie eleison*, the *Gloria in excelsis* commencing with the words: *Et in terra pax*, the *Credo* beginning at the words: *Et in unum Dominum*, the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus Dei*. The plain chant book called the *Graduale* contains the airs, to which these parts are to be sung; and in many dioceses or provinces the same melodies have been set in modern notation for the sake of the laity who may not know the plain chant. Any one acquainted with the chants of the *Ordinary of the Mass* will admit that they are most expressive of devotion and that they harmonize with the seasons of the Church. We cannot but admire the wisdom of the Church which by causing these melodies to be sung, year after year, according to the liturgical festivals, supplies her children with an easy way of learning her sacred songs, so as to chant the praise of their Creator with one voice and heart.

It would be a consoling fact to know that the number of churches, where all the parts of the solemn or High Mass are sung, is fast multiplying. Nothing can be more solemn and edifying, than this service performed by regular chanters, whom the congregation joins at the *Gloria in excelsis*, *Credo*, etc.

It is, however, to be deplored that, whilst the plain chant has been introduced in many churches, they do not employ the same editions of the liturgical books.

We have plain chant books published in Canada, in Belgium, in France and Germany, probably in other countries, and in different dioceses of the same country. Hence results a considerable lack of uniformity in the ecclesiastical chant. A Canadian priest, to whom I once mentioned this want of uniformity, pleasantly suggested as a solution of the difficulty

that the Quebec plain chant be adopted by the Catholic churches throughout the world. However the question has been definitely settled by two Pontiffs of our own time whose authority is more than local.

Our great Pontiffs, Pius IX and Leo XIII, have labored to bring about uniformity in the chant of the Church, and we now possess *typical* editions of all the plain chant books, necessary to carry out the complete Liturgy. These books have been published by the house of Fr. Pustet of New York, and are declared by a decree of the Congregation of Rites, *to be the only music now accepted and approved by the Holy See, as the recognized chant.* They are used throughout all Italy, in many churches of France, Germany and Belgium; in very many churches of the United States, nay in the far distant missions of Africa, China, etc. The plenary Council of all the Bishops of Ireland in 1815 decreed (Decr. xv, 573.) "Libri chorales et liturgici, nuper Ratisbonae, a Pustet bibliopola Catholico editi, in missa et vesperis cantandis, tam in seminariis quam in ecclesiis posthac quam primum adhibeantur." (Conf. Decree of the Cong. of Rites, 14th, Apr., 1877, confirmed by Leo XIII on the same day and year. See also an admirable article on liturgical chants, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, VOL. II, p. 20.)

By procuring the liturgical works of Fred. Pustet, our reverend clergy will be able, at a small cost, to supply their choirs with the necessary music and chant books, and the singing from the typical books offers no greater difficulty than the singing of plain-chant from other editions.

The house of Pustet has published, in square notes (on four lines), the *Graduale*, *Antiphonarium*, *Ordinarium Missae*, *sive cantiones Missae communes ad Ordinarium Missae*, and the organ accompaniments for all the parts of the morning and evening services.

The Roman Hymnal of Rev. J. B. Young, S.J., contains the chants of the Ordinary of the Mass, Vespers, Benediction, set to modern notation, so that the members of the choir can readily follow the corresponding text of the above-mentioned works.

It may be asked: Should we then discontinue all figured music in Masses? By no means, for the Popes themselves encourage polyphone compositions, if they be not opposed to the spirit of the Church and the directions of the S. Congregation of Rites, or the decrees of Councils.

"During the Mass no singing is to be allowed which mutilates the words of the Liturgy, or repeats or changes them in such a way as to destroy their significance." (Conc. Plen. Balt. iii, 117.)

But is it not true that the fewer we shall have of elaborate figured Masses, the better it will be for the devotion sought in the divine service? I, for one, think that the composers and leaders of choirs are frequently very much mistaken in imagining that their artistic efforts are to the taste of our congregations. The writer has been fifty-two years a priest, and most of this time in rural and poor parishes. His experience is that Catholics go to Mass for the sake of the Mass, and that long, unintelligible music keeps them from the church.

It is undoubtedly true that where musical performances of the Mass are indiscriminately tolerated without any supervision or sanction of ecclesiastical authority, we too often hear extravagances against which Catholic feeling revolts.

For instance, we hear at times forty or fifty repetitions of the *Kyrie Eleison;* again, certain invocations in the *Gloria*, distinct in sense and necessarily disconnected, yet which are sung to one musical idea, as though they were repetitions of one and the same thought or aspiration. We hear the *Homo factus est* played or chanted upon a prolonged and doleful air, contrary to the joyful harmony of the angels at the birth of Christ; the *Dona nobis pacem* is sometimes sung as if it were like a charge on the eve of battle, to the great discomfort of some good Christians, who desire to enjoy, after their communion, the peace that was brought down to them by the *Lamb of God.*

I repeat my assertion: The fewer we shall have of these elaborate Masses, now much in fashion, the better it will be for devotion. Granting that the composition is all that it

ought to be, it will, in many places, be impossible to find the requisite number of sufficiently trained voices to do justice to the artistic character of the composition. At the same time it is deeply mortifying that many churches employ artists who are without religion, and frequently even infidels. There is also commonly too much time lost in rehearsing for these Masses, and often, when the great day comes, after six or seven practices, it happens that one or more of the principal singers are absent, having taken with them the harmony required for rendering the Mass; or, through some accident, the copy of the solo parts is missing, and the singer, remembering the words only in part, destroys the integrity of the Liturgy. The sacred chant is mutilated, curtailed, rendered unintelligible.

They who are acquainted with the doctrine of St. Paul will undoubtedly be much impressed, as I have been, by the following consideration:

Every Christian is a member of Jesus Christ, as intimately united to Him as the branch is to the vine. By baptism, our bodies became the members of Christ, and our souls the living abode of His Holy Spirit. As a symbol of this union, the Church at our baptism sanctified all our senses through the sign of the cross.

She took possession of our whole being, in the name of the divine Spouse. This union we acknowledge and ratify when we bless ourselves and offer ourselves to the Most Holy Trinity. The Church in the Mass reminds us of this ever glorious condition when she tells us repeatedly, to pray with one voice *through Christ our Lord.* The Victim is on the altar praying, praising, adoring, particularly for those present at the holy sacrifice. They all should in worshipping be animated by the spirit of Jesus Christ, *per Christum, cum Christo, et in Christo . . . . . qui spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus.* But, who ought to have a greater share in the spirit of fervor and adoration which belongs to our great High Priest, if not the composer of sacred music, and they who, as chanters, do by office more especially represent Him and the Church? A sentiment of dread and disgust comes upon us when we associate the prayers and

adorations of the Son of God with the theatrical music too often heard in our churches. "What agreement is there of Christ with Belial?"

From the preceding pages the reader will infer that the writer is a lover of plain chant. I am indeed, a great admirer of the liturgical chants of Holy Mother Church, so much so, in truth, that I believe that they who composed them partook in the assistance of the Holy Ghost, who inspired the words. Yet in my long experience I have heard many objections urged against the Gregorian chant. The unfavorable criticising came, I should say, in every instance from persons who had no real knowledge of music of any kind, or who had never heard the Gregorian music properly performed. Often, on the other hand, I have noticed that strangers who for the first time heard a Gregorian Mass sung by a chorus of male voices were perfectly charmed by its solemn cadences.

I might here appeal to our reverend clergy and ask them whether they did not realize an habitual increase of fervor when during their seminary life they united their voices with those of their fellow-students, praising God, and imploring His mercy in the majestic chants of the Church.

But enough of this. Perhaps I may have succeeded in convincing my reverend brethren of the clergy of the wisdom of accepting the following two suggestions:

1.—Have as few Masses of the elaborate style of figured music sung in your churches as you can.

2.—Out of respect for the recommendations of Leo XIII and Pius IX, as well as to aid in bringing about perfect uniformity in the execution of the liturgical chants do, by all means, use the liturgical works of Pustet.

✠ LOUIS, BP. OF BURLINGTON.

CONFERENCES.

AUTHORSHIP OF THE "MEDIA VITA IN MORTE SUMUS."

We have been asked to give an authentic account of the authorship of a hymn commonly attributed to Luther under the title "Media vita in morte sumus."

In the first place we would call attention to the fact that in the mediæval MS. liturgies from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries an antiphon is found (used in the Office for Lent) which begins with the above-mentioned words. This antiphon has been made the text of various hymns, the first of which is attributed to St. Notker, who died in 912. We give both the antiphon and the hymn as taken from the *Hymni Sacri Antiquorum Patrum Monasterii S. Galli.* (Edit. Patrolog. Migne Vol. lxxxvi, col. 58, B. C. D.)

"Media vita in morte sumus, quem quaerimus adjutorem, nisi te Domine, qui pro peccatis nostris juste irasceris."

Ach.

Homo perpende fragilis,
Mortalis et instabilis,
Quod vitare non poteris,
Mortem, quocumque ieris.
Aufert te, saepissime,
Dum vivis libentissime.
Sancte Deus.

Vae.

Calamitas inediae,
Vermis fremit invidiae,
Dum audit flentem animam
Mortalis essem utinam !
Nec Christi fortis gladius,
Transiret, et non alius.
Sancte Fortis.

Heu.

Nil valet nobilitas
Neque sedis sublimitas,
Nil generis potentia,
Nil rerum affluentia,
Plus pura conscientia
Valet mundi scientia.

"Sancte et misericors Salvator, amarae morti ne tradas nos."

The Collector of the S. Gall collection prefixes this hymn by the following remark: *Sequentis lamentationis prosam fecit sanctus Notkerus, cum in Martinsdobel pons in loco praecipiti et periculosissimo aedificaretur. Quis autem versus adjecerit nescio. Descripsi ex vetustissimo Codice ubi cum modernis etiam notis est.*[1]

It would almost appear as if the *prosa* in this case is the hymn, and the *versus* is the antiphon which precedes and follows the hymn; for the authorship of the versicle is hardly anything worthy of note, since similar passages may be found in the Psalms and throughout the Old Testament. The words placed at the end of the stanzas: "Sancte Deus, sancte Fortis, sancte et misericors Salvator" etc., are apparently the same invocations as those used in the Improperia of Good Friday, only that the latter retain the Greek appellations "*Agios o theos*, sanctus Deus; *Agios ischyros*, sanctus Fortis; *Agios athanatos eleison imas*, sanctus immortalis miserere nobis."

The first part of the antiphon "Media vita" etc. is not to be found however in the *Roman* Liturgy of the present day. On the other hand it is given in the German Lutheran Service and in the English Book of Common Prayer. In the Anglican Burial Service of 1549 we read "In the midst of life we be in death: of whom may we seek for succour but of Thee, O Lord, which for our sins justly art moved? Yet O Lord God most holy, O Lord most mighty" etc. This is

1 Prof. March, in his edition of Latin Hymns, attributing the antiphon with others to St. Notker, says in a note: "This world-famous hymn is said to have been composed while watching the samphire-gatherers on the precipices around St. Gall."

supposed to have been taken from the York Breviary where the antiphon occurs in the Office for Lent. Adaptations of the antiphon are used in various Protestant churches.

It is evident that the words with their sentiment have been borrowed from the Catholic church service as preserved in the mediæval *local* liturgies.

But something more and distinct must be said of the different hymns to which this antiphone supplied the text.

We have already seen the hymn ascribed to St. Notker. Its connection with the antiphon is, however, one of merest connection of thought. The writer does not pretend to embody the thoughts of the antiphon, but takes occasion apparently from the theme to sing a kindred thought, and we do not know that the verses of Notker were ever translated.

A versified German translation of the antiphon itself appears to have been made at a very early date for the use of the people who probably sang it in congregational fashion during Lent or at burials. Hoffman von Fallersleben in his summary of church hymns up to Luther's time gives several versions. In a note to the first he says: "Notker Balbulus, monk of St. Gall is supposed to be the author of this hymn. It was frequently sung on all sorts of occasions, even as battle-song and as a charm against evil." In another note he says: "The text in this version was preserved for a long time even in the evangelical church although the latter had Luther's new version since 1524." Whether Notker really was the author of the German version as Hoffman v. F. assumes is doubtful, although we have seen that he has a title to the Latin hymn.

Luther's version in the form in which it is used to-day in the so-called evangelical churches has indeed a certain claim to originality. It consists like the Latin hymn given above of three stanzas. The first of these is the old German version of the antiphon taken from the German Catholic Service, only somewhat modified; from this stanza the hymn takes its title. The other two stanzas are added by Luther, nor can they be called imitations of Notker's hymn unless as far as the latter work may have suggested the composition.

Mearns in Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology mentions quite a number of English versions of the antiphon and some made after Luther's hymn. The general adoption of the hymn in the Protestant church-service probably contributed to its gradual disuse in the local Catholic liturgies all the more because the introduction of the Roman ritual books throughout the continental churches was facilitated by the art of printing.

RUTHENIAN PRIESTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Some time ago we published in THE REVIEW, Vol. VII, p. 66 (July), a letter of the S. Congregation of the Propaganda, addressed through Cardinal Gibbons to the Ordinaries of the United States, in reference to certain priests of the Greek rite. The letter stated that the Bishops of the *Ruthenian* rite in Europe had been informed that the *presbyteri uxorati* under their jurisdiction, who had been sent to the United States, were to be recalled, and that henceforth only celibate priests should be sent to administer to the wants of the Ruthenian Catholics in this country. These priests, whilst they were to retain their own rite, would, nevertheless, during their stay in this country, be under the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary in whose territory they resided, from whom, also, they were to receive their faculties.

The concluding paragraph of the letter stated that the same course of discipline here prescribed with regard to priests of the *Ruthenian* rite was to be observed in reference to *all priests of the Oriental rite*—"S. Congregationem etiam in mandatis dare ut eadem fideliter observentur atque *ad alios quoscumque ritus Orientalis presbyteros* applicentur."

Considering the varied character of the immigrants who profess one or other of the Oriental rites, each with some peculiar distinction, not only in their language and liturgy, but in ecclesiastical discipline, a practical question arises as to who are the priests here designated?

Moreover, there are a large number of schismatic Greek

Catholics in this country who have their own validly ordained priests, and, though these are not under the acknowledged jurisdiction of our Bishops, the case of conversions among them would give rise to the question of whether, and how far, they come under the discipline laid down by the decree of the S. Congregation.

P. Nilles, S.J., who is thoroughly familiar with the ecclesiastical discipline of the Oriental churches, as is shown in his various works on the subject, comments on the decree as follows :[1]

"Who are the *alii quicumque presbyteri?* In the first place, those Uniate priests of the Greek rite who use the same *old Slavic* language in the liturgy as the Ruthenians. This includes the Austro-Hungarian Christians who come from the Greek Catholic dioceses : Eperjes, Kreutz (Crisiensis), Muncacs, and from the Uniate apostolic Vicariates of Bulgaria.

Secondly, the priests belonging to the *Italo-Graeci* Catholics who use the *Greek* language in the liturgy. Many of these are immigrated from Calabria and Sicily (under the name of Italians). Others are from the Greek colonies of Corsica, Malta and Algiers.

A third class of priests who come under this decree are the *Syrian* and *Egyptian Melchites* who use the *Arabic* language in their liturgy. These form, next to the Ruthenians proper, the largest contingent of immigrants into the New World. According to an official report made by P. Maron Farath to the Patriarchal See of Antioch, there were in 1890 more than five hundred Syrian Melchites in the city of Chicago alone, for whose religious care no provision had been made until then.

A last, hitherto in America sparsely represented class of immigrants, to whom the decision of the Propaganda applies, are the Greek Catholic Roumanians who use the *Romanic* language in their liturgy.

In regard to the schismatic clergy from whose ranks conversions to the orthodox faith occur on occasions which seem especially favorable in America owing to the absence of a

1 Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie, I. Qu. 1893, p. 162.

local protectorate, F. Nilles observes that the Holy See has hitherto, as a rule, respected the actual marriage tie in their case; this is to be particularly remembered with regard to the Russian secular clergy who are obliged to marry. Among the schismatic priests of Oriental rite, we have in America those who attend to the Russian immigrants on the Aleutian Islands in the North Pacific, and those of Alaska, whose Bishop resides in San Francisco. The influx of these religious elements is constantly growing in many parts of the States.

THE CONFRATERNITY "DE BONA MORTE."

According to the decree of the 17th July, 1891,[1] this beautiful Confraternity can be established by Bishops who have been authorized to erect all Confraternities, but not with the indulgences attached to it. In order to do this, the decree of S. Cong. Indulg. dated September 17, 1887, must be observed by virtue of which Bishops that have the above-mentioned authorization can indeed establish the Confraternity, but in order to obtain the indulgences annexed to it, they must procure from the Father General of the Society of Jesus the affiliation of the new Confraternity to the Archconfraternity (Congregatio Primaria) at Rome.

Here the question arises: Does the decision contained in the last-mentioned decree affect our Bishops also, who by Form C, n. 9, are empowered to erect the Confraternity de Bona Morte? I answer: *It does not*, for in a decree of June, 1889,[2] the late Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, John Simeoni, declared that those countries which are under the direction of the Propaganda are not bound by this decision. Hence, our Bishops can establish, all confraternities with their indulgences, that come within the scope of the faculties granted to them by the Apostolic See. There is but one exception to this, viz.: the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary.

J. P.

1 See Analecta. 2 Am. Eccl. Rev. 1889, page 465.

THE FIRE OF HELL.

Anent the recent discussion raised by Professor Mivart, regarding the true nature of hell-fire it may be of interest to recall an answer of the S. Poenitentiaria in a case published in *Il divin Salvatore* under date May 27, 1890.

A parish priest of Mantua (Italy) proposed the following question as a *casus conscientiae:* A penitent had expressed it as his conviction that the "fire" of hell spoken of in the sacred writings had not a literal but a *metaphorical* sense and meant something extremely painful. Could such a person be absolved in consideration of the fact that similar views are openly expressed by others in his own locality?

The answer of the S. Poenitentiaria (April 30, 1890) was: *Sacra Poenitentiaria ad praemissa respondit: "Hujusmodi poenitentes diligenter instruendos esse, et pertinaces non esse absolvendos."*

A. J. S.

THE BIRETUM.

Qu. Has an ordinary priest the right to wear a four-cornered biretum or is this the exclusive privilege of those who have acquired the title of Doctor of Theology?

Resp. The distinction between three and four-cornered biretums is observed only in Italy, whence the custom has been transferred to the United States; but it does not indicate a recognized privilege. The ordinary biretum worn in Catholic countries (except Italy) has four corners.

RURAL DEANS.

Qu. Will you kindly answer in the pages of the REVIEW the following questions?

What are the duties of Rural Deans? Some say that the duty of a Dean consists solely in distributing the Sacred oils to the Clergy who are in his district? Is this the whole extent of his duty.

Have the Deans any right to the title *Very Reverend?*

Resp. A history of the office of Rural Deans, together with their *Duties, Rights and Privileges, and Manner of appointment* has been given in a previous number of the REVIEW.

We repeat a summary of the article.

The duties of rural Deans are in general to arrange and preside at ecclesiastical Conferences held within their districts. They, as a rule, are the channels and guardians of the ordinances of the Bishop and expected to communicate to the latter any serious disorder or violation of ecclesiastical canons within their jurisdiction. They are the customary auditors of Church-accounts, and supposed to make periodically detailed examination of the parochial books; to keep note, for the information of the Bishop and his successors, as well as for the newly appointed pastors, of the financial standing of each parish in their circuit, *i. e.*, of the regular income, expenses, standing debts, together with an inventory of the property of the different churches and parish-houses. It is their duty, when a vacancy occurs in a parish through sickness, death, or otherwise, to arrange for a temporary supply of the vacant charge, to superintend the funeral and in general to protect the interests of the vacant rectory until a regular appointment has been made by the Ordinary.

As for the rights and privileges of Rural Deans, there is no general statute which gives them a special title to distinctions in dress or otherwise. The custom of addressing an official "Very Reverend" is mainly conventional and supposed to be sanctioned by general usage, unless the diocesan or provincial statutes regulate such honors. Rural Deans enjoy the honor of precedence among rectors of churches in their districts. The Bishop may delegate certain faculties to his Rural Deans, not only on points of jurisdiction but also otherwise, such as to consecrate chalices and altar-stones, to bless bells, sacred vestments, etc.

In the United States the *Facultates extraordinariae D. and E.* may be delegated by our Bishops. For further details see THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Vol. II (1890), pp. 90 seq.

WAS IT A RESERVED CASE?

Qu. A few weeks ago I was called to a sick child, who, the messenger told me, was dying. Upon arriving at the house I found a girl three-years of age, unbaptized and dying rapidly. Immediately I gave it private baptism and then inquired into the cause of the evident neglect on the part of the parents regarding their religious obligation. They told me that they had been married some years ago before a Presbyterian minister in Scotland, and that since they came to this country they had entirely neglected their religion. The father said that he had never been baptized although he professed to be a Presbyterian. I endeavored to impress the mother, who claimed to be a Catholic, with the gravity of the sin she had committed, and told her how the Church censured such acts as a species of apostacy. Before I left the house both parents promised to renew their consent so as insure the validity of the marriage, and the father pledged himself to comply with all that the Catholic Church demands in the case of such marriages. I then wrote to the Bishop for a dispensation to render the marriage valid, but forgot to ask for *Faculties* to absolve the Catholic party. Later on it occurred to me that probably there was no need of asking for special faculties because censure in such cases is, I thought, incurred only where there is *communicatio in sacris coram haeretico*, and since there was no marriage in this case, one of the parties being unbaptized, there could be no *communicatio in sacris*, and hence no censure. Was this conclusion a right one? Could I absolve without asking for *Faculties*?

Resp. There appears to have been no necessity for obtaining special *Faculties* to absolve the party in question, although for reasons different from the one given by our Reverend Correspondent.

The *reservation*, in the case of a Catholic marrying before a Protestant minister rests for the United States, upon the legislation of the Council of Baltimore. According to n. 127, Tit. IV. (Conc. Pl. Balt. III). Catholics, within the territory comprised under the jurisdiction of the Council, who marry or attempt to marry before a non-Catholic preacher, incur excommunication, absolution from which is reserved to the Bishop of the diocese in which the penitent seeks it. The precise extent of this reservation must be judged from the terms of the Decree. These are:

"Item decernimus Catholicos, qui coram ministro cujuscumque sectae acatholicae matrimonium contraxerint vel attentaverint, extra propriam dioecesim in quolibet statu vel territorio sub ditione praesulum qui huic Concilio adsunt vel adesse debent, excommunicationem incurrere Episcopo reservatam a quo tamen quilibet dictorum Ordinariorum sive per se, sive per sacerdotem ad hoc delegatum absolvere poterit."

"Quod si in propria dioecesi ita deliquerint, statuimus eos ipso facto innodatos esse excommunicatione quae, nisi absque fraude legis alium Episcopum adeant, eorum Ordinario reservatur."

It will be noticed in the above text of the Decree that the censure of those who partly deny their faith by seeking the ministration of a non-Catholic preacher, as witness to their marriage-contract, is limited to Catholics who have committed the offence within the territory for which the Council of Baltimore legislates "in quolibet statu vel territorio sub ditione praesulum qui huic Concilio adsunt vel adesse debent."

Hence it follows that strangers who have contracted or have attempted to contract such marriage outside of the jurisdiction of the United States (*i. e.* the territory to which the legislation of the Council of Baltimore applies) are not included under the censure and can be absolved by any approved confessor without special *Faculties*.

As to the reason given by our Reverend Correspondent, namely that there was no *communicatio in sacris* (because one of the parties was not baptized), it can hardly be allowed, since the *communicatio in sacris* consists here in the act of the Catholic party going before a Protestant minister for the authorization of the marriage-contract which, though invalid, would come under the censure on the ground of an *attempted marriage* a restriction which is conveyed in the words "*vel attentaverint*" of the Decree.

ANALECTA.

EPISTOLA LEONIS D. P. PAPAE XIII DE SECTA MASSONICA.

VENERABILIBVS FRATRIBVS ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS ITALIAE.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES.

Salvtem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Inimica vis, instinctu impulsuque mali daemonis cum christiano nomine sueta confligere, certos homines sibi semper adiunxit, in id consociatos ut traditas divinitus doctrinas deditâ operâ pervertere, ipsamque christianam rempublicam distrahere funestis dissidiis conarentur. Atque istae velut compositae ad oppugnationem cohortes nemo nescit quantum Ecclesiae cladem omni tempore attulerint. Iamvero sectarum, quotquot antea fuere institutis Catholicis infensae, in ea revixere spiritus, quae *secta Massonica* nominatur, quaeque virium et opum valida, acerrimam bello facem praeferens, quidquid usquam sacri est, aggreditur. Eam quidem, quod probe nostis, saeculi unius dimidiatique spatio, romanorum Pontificum decessorum Nostrorum non semel sed saepius sententia proscripsit: eamdem Nosmetipsi, ut oportebat, damnavimus, monitis vehementer populis christianis, ut eius insidias summa providentia caverent, conatusque nefarios fortiter, ut asseclas Iesu Christi decet, refutarent. Quin etiam, ne obreperet ignavia et sopor, consulto studuimus sectae perniciosissimae aperire mysteria, et quibus artibus in excidium Catholicae rei niteretur, velut intento digito demonstravimus. Nihilominus, si fateri volumus id quod res est, plurimos italorum parum cautos parumque providos inconsiderata quaedam securitas facit: ideo magnitudinem periculi aut omnino non vident, aut non ex veritate metiuntur. Atqui fides avita, parta hominibus per Iesum Christum salus, et quod consequens est, ipsa christianae humanitatis benefacta indiscrimine vertuntur. Siquidem nihil timens, nemini cedens, maiora quotidie audet secta Massonum: totas civitates velut contagio invasit, omnibusque reipublicae institutis se

implicare altius in dies nititur, coniurata, quod passim solet, Catholicam religionem, principium et fontem bonorum maximorum, italico generi eripere. Hinc adhibitae ad oppugnandam fidem divinam infinitae artes; hinc spreta, oppressa legibus, legitima Ecclesiae libertas. Receptum et doctrina et re, non vim non rationem in Ecclesia perfectae societatis inesse: antistare rempublicam, sacraeque potestati principatum civilem antecedere. Ex qua doctrina perniciosa et falsa, Sedis Apostolicae iudicio saepe damnata, cum mala multa consequuntur, tum hoc maxime, ut inferant se gubernatores rei civilis, quo minime fas est, nec vereantur ad se traducere quod Ecclesiae detraxerint. Videtis in beneficiis ecclesiasticis illud quale sit, quod ius percipiendi fructus sibi arrogant dare, demere, ad arbitrium. Nec alterum minus insidiosum, quod Clerum inferioris ordinis permulcere pollicitando cogitant. Quae res quorsum pertineat, facile est dispicere, maxime quia ipsi huius consilii auctores non satis curant occultare quid velint. Volunt nimirum administros sacrorum in partes suas blande compellere, permistosque semel rebus novis ab obsequio legitimae potestatis divellere. Quamquam haud satis hac in re videntur Clericorum nostratium cognosse virtutem: qui sane tot iam annos, tam multis modis exerciti, exempla abstinentiae et fidei edidere non obscura, ut omnino confidendum sit, in eadem religione officii, qualiacumque tempora inciderent, Deo adiutore, constanter permansuros.

At vero ex his, quae perbreviter attigimus, facile apparet quid possit secta Massonum itemque quid expetat ut extremum. Quod autem auget malum, quodque cogitare sine magna animi sollicitudine non possumus, nimis multi etiam ex nostratibus numerantur, quos nomen sectae operamve dare, suarum spes utilitatum et misera ambitio subigit. Quae cum ita sint, episcopalem caritatem vestram, urgente proposito conscientia officii, appellamus, Venerabiles Fratres, in primisque petimus ut eorum quos modo diximus, sit vobis proposita salus: in iis ab errore certissimoque interitu revocandis assidue et constanter vestra certet industria. Extricare posse, qui se Massonum impedivit in plagas, res profecto est et multi negotii et exitu anceps, si sectae ingenium spectetur: nullius tamen desperanda sanatio, quia caritatis apostolicae mira vis est, Deo nimirum opitulante, cuius in potestate arbitrioque ipsae sunt hominum voluntates.

Dein excubandum in omnem occasionem, ut sanari ii quoque possint, qui timiditate in hoc genere peccant: qui videlicet non suopte ingenio pravo, sed mollitia animi atque inopia consilii ad

favendum coeptis Massonicis delabuntur. Admodum gravis est illa Felicis III decessoris Nostri in hanc rem sententia: *Error, cui non resistitur, approbatur; et veritas, quae non defensatur, opprimitur . . . Non caret scrupulo societatis occultae, qui evidenti facinori desinit obviare.* Fractos horum spiritus attollere necesse est, traducendis cogitationibus ad exempla maiorum, ad custodem officii et dignitatis, fortitudinem, ut pigeat omnino ac pudeat facere quicquam aut fecisse non viriliter. Est enim vita nostra omnis cuidam dimicationi proposita, in qua maxime de salute decernitur, nihilque homini christiano turpius, quam claudicare in officio propter ignaviam.

Pariter omnibus modis fulciendi, qui per imprudentiam ruunt: de iis intelligimus, nec exiguo numero, qui simulatione capti variisque illecebris deliniti, illigari se societate Massonica sinunt, inscii quid agant. De his magna spes esse debet, Venerabiles Fratres, aliquando Deo aspirante posse errorem deponere et vera cernere, maxime si vos, quod vehementer rogamus, studueritis fictam sectae speciem detrahere, et occulta consiliorum retegere. Quamquam haec ne occulta quidem nunc videri possunt, posteaquam ipsimet conscii multis modis prodidere. His ipsis postremis mensibus audita iterum per Italiam vox est consilia Massonum usque ad ostentationem vulgo enunciantis. Repudiari funditus religionem Deo auctore constitutam, atque omnia cum privata tum publica meris *naturalismi* principiis administrari volunt: idque instaurationem societatis civilis impie simul ac stulte appellant. Quo igitur praecipitatura civitas, si populus christianus non induxerit animum vigilare, laborare, saluti consulere?

Sed in tanta rerum malarum audacia, nec satis est cavere sectae teterrimae insidias: illud quoque necessarium, capessere pugnam: idque sumptis a fide divina armis iis ipsis, quae olim contra *ethnicismum* valuerunt. Quapropter vestrum est, Venerabiles Fratres, accendere suasione, hortatu, exemplo animos: et in Clero populoque nostro studium religionis salutisque fovere operosum, constans, impavidum, cuiusmodi apud catholicos ex gentibus ceteris in similibus caussis haud rara videmus enitescere. Ardorem animi pristinum in fide avita tuenda, vulgo aiunt apud italas gentes deferbuisse. Nec fortasse falso: propterea quod si animorum habitus utrimque spectetur, plus quidem videntur adhibere contentionis qui inferunt religioni bellum quam qui propulsant. At vero salutem, cupientibus nihil medium inter laboriosum certamen aut interitum. Itaque in socordibus et languidis excitanda, vobis adnitentibus, virtus est: in strenuis, tuenda: pariterque omni dissidiorum extincto semine,

efficiendum ut ductu auspiciisque vestris una omnes mente eademque disciplina in certamen animose descendant.

Gravitate rei, prohibendique periculi necessitate perspecta, ipsum Italiae populum compellare litteris decrevimus. Eas litteras una cum his ad vos, Venerabiles Fratres, curavimus perferendas : eritque diligentiae vestrae quam latissime propagare in vulgus, itemque opportuna explanatione, ubi opus esse videatur, populo interpretari. Qua ratione, ita adsit propitius Deus, spes est futurum, ut excitentur animi prementium contemplatione malorum, et ad remedia, quae indicavimus sese sine cunctatione convertant.

Divinorum munerum auspicem, et benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, populisque fidei vestrae concreditis Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die VIII Decembris An. MDCCCLXXXXII, Pontificatus Nostri decimoquinto.

LEO PP. XIII.

DE SODALITATIBUS BONAE MORTIS.

Ex S. Congregatione Indulgentiarum.

Congregatio Primaria quae Bonae Mortis nuncupatur sub invocatione D. N. Jesu Christi in Cruce morientis ac Beatissimae Virginis Mariae ejus Genitricis perdolentis finem habet, ut fideles ad mortem quam felicissime obeundam rite disponantur per jugem passionis Christi memoriam ejusque publice privatimque recolendae studium, et in primis per vitam recte Christianeque institutam.

Huius vero Primariae Congregationis statuta generalia definiunt quaedam pia exercitia in communi peracta, ita ud sodales conveniant in Ecclesiam Congregationis, vel singulis sextis feriis aut diebus Dominicis, vel saltem semel aut bis in mense, et in his piis coetibus conciones habeantur et preces una simul a Sodalibus fundantur.

Quum autem Congregationum Bonae Mortis quae per diversas Orbis partes eriguntur statuta peculiaria originalibus statutis, supra recensitis, sint conformanda, quantum tempora et locorum adjuncta suadebunt, ideo quaeritur :

I. Utrum Primariae aggregari possit Congregatio Bonae Mortis quae sub invocatione tantum Sancti Josephi erigeretur, omisso omnino titulo D. N. Jesu Christi in Cruce morientis et B.V. M. perdolentis, et cujus statuta nullam habent mentionem de piis conventibus atque exercitationibus supradictis pro certis diebus, et tantummodo

praescribunt, ut fundantur preces pro unoquoque socio cum in agoniam devenerit, ut mortuos sodales ad sepulturam comitentur et eleemosynae colligantur ad Missas pro sociis defunctis celebrandas : talis enim Congregatio non videretur esse ejusdem nominis et instituti ?

II. An Episcopi qui gaudent indulto eis concedente erigendi in sua Dioecesi Confraternitatis cum Indulgentiis quibus gaudent Archiconfraternitates ejusdem nominis et instituti in alma Urbe existentes, erigere valeant pias Sodalitates, uti supra expositum est, cum Indulgentiis concessis Primariae Congregationi Bonae Mortis ?

Et quatenus negative,

III. Num petenda sit sanatio praedictarum piarum Unionum Bonae Mortis in Diocesi Albiensi erectarum, assumptis tamen titulo Unionis primariae et statutis eidem conformibus prouti suadebunt adjuncta locorum in quibus jam erectae sunt ; an potius denuo erigendae ?

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, audito unius ex Consultoribus voto, praefatis dubiis respondit :

Ad I.—*Negative.*

Ad II.—*Negative.*

Ad III.—*Negative* quoad primam partem ; *affirmative* quoad secundam ; servato tamen Decreto nuper edito ab hoc S. Congregatione sub die 17 Septembris, 1887.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem Sacrae Congregationis die 17 Julii, 1891.

L. ✠ S. J. *Card.* D'ANNIBALE, *Praefectus.*
ALEX. *Archiep.* NICOPOLIT. *Secretarius.*

DUBIUM DE BAPTISMO RELATE AD VALIDITATEM MATRIMONII.

Matrimonium in Casibus Baptismi Dubii.

IN DUBIO DE VALORE BAPTISMI AB HAERETICIS COLLATI.

I.—Sanctissimus in audientia habita die 20 Decembris 1837, audita relatione dubii, utrum scilicet, in praesumptione baptismi invalide collati parti haereticae matrimonium cum Catholica a Sede Apostolica dispensata inire cupienti, conferri debeat iterum baptisma sub conditione, dixit :

Detur Decretum, latum die 17 Septembris[1] 1830, ut sequitur. (Quaesitum erat) an Calvinistae et Lutherani in illis partibus degentes quorum baptisma dubium et suspectum est, infideles habendi sint, ita ut inter eos et catholicos disparitatis cultus impedimentum dirimens adesse censeatur? Cui instantiae responsum fuit:

1. Quoad haereticos, quorum sectae ritualia praescribunt collationem baptismi absque necessario usu materiae et formae essentialis, debet examinari casus particularis.

2. Quoad alios qui juxta eorum ritualia baptizant valide, validum censendum esse baptisma. Quod si dubium persistat, etiam in primo casu, censendum est validum baptisma in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii.

3. Si autem certe cognoscatur nullum baptisma ex consuetudine actuali illius sectae, nullum est matrimonium.

Hisque omnibus SSmus superaddi mandavit: in tertio casu praefati decreti respiciente nullitatem certam baptismi in parte haeretica, recurratur in casibus particularibus.

II.—Ad dubium hujus tenoris: "Utrum baptismus dubius censendus sit validus in ordine ad matrimonium etiam in eo sensu, quod invalidum sit matrimonium inter haereticum dubie baptizatum et infidelem, propter impedimentum disparitatis cultus, S. Congr. Univ. Inquisitionis fer. IV. die 18 Dec. 1872 respondit: *Affirmative.*

Ex S. C. Inq. ad Episcopum Monacensem.

Illustrissime et Reverendissime Domine:

Literis datis die 18 Aprilis currentis anni Vicarius capitularis, ad animarum quieti et saluti prospiciendum, declarari rogabat a S. Sede, quod per dispensationem super impedimento mixtae religionis, si dubium de baptismo haereticae partis persistat, ut istis in regionibus non raro contingit, etiam dispensatio super impedimento disparitatis cultus ad cautelam concessa intelligenda sit. Res ad hanc supremam Congr. S. Officii delata est, quae adprobante SS. D. N. Tibi pro norma communicanda sequentia decreta mandavit, scilicet:

I. Proposito dubio: An Calvinistae et Lutherani, quorum baptisma dubium et suspectum est, infideles habendi sint, ita ut inter eos et Catholicos disparitatis cultus impedimentum dirimens adesse censeatur?

1 *Rectius:* Novembris (cfr. infra Respons S.O.) de 18 Sept. 1890, et plura alia Decreta ap. Feije de imp. n. 464, 567, in quibus omnibus ponitur Novembris loco Septembris.

Feria IV. die 17 November, 1830, responsum fuit : Quoad haereticos quorum sectae ritualia praescribunt collationem baptismi, absque necessario usu materiae et formae essentialis, examinari debet casus particularis ; quoad alios, qui juxta eorum ritualia baptizant valide, validum censendum esse baptisma. Quod si dubium persistat etiam in 1° casu censendum esse validum baptisma in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii ; si autem certo cognoscatur nullum baptisma ex consuetudine actuali illius sectae, nullum est matrimonium.

II. Proposito dubio : Utrum, si dubium de valore baptismi remaneat, et non visum sit opportunum solvere dubium de his, qui sic dubie baptizati sunt, in rebus, quae ad matrimonium spectant habendi sint ac si vere et valide baptizati fuerint?

Feria IV., 9 Sept., 1868, responsum fuit : Censendum est validum in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii.

Romae, die Sept., 1890.

R. *Card.* Monaco.

IN DUBIO DE FACTO BAPTISMI HAERETICORUM.

Episcopus Savannensis exponit quod inter ceteros difficilis solutionis casus, qui in his Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis Statuum ecclesiasticis provinciis, ac in hac quoque mea diocesi occurrunt, reperitur etiam sequens.

Frequenter contingit, ut duo acatholici inter se contraxerint matrimonium et ignoretur utrum sive uterque sive alteruter fuerit baptizatus. Ejusmodi matrimoniis inter duos acatholicos, aut sine dispensatione inter catholicum unum et acatholicum alterum, initis, in nulla ex dioecesibus nostris obstat impedimentum clandestinitatis. Contracto sic matrimonio, haud raro evenit, ut compars compartem deserat. Post aliquod tempus partes ita separatae non infrequenter ad alias nuptias convolant, superstite altera parte.

Scio equidem, casu quo, spectata qualitate probationum pro et contra, *dubitetur* num vel alteri vel utrique parti collatum fuerit baptisma, standum esse pro valore matrimonii cum tali dubio ac sine dispensatione contracti, *usquedum non constet illud fuisse invalidum.* Verum, deficientibus *caeteris* pro utraque dubii parte probationibus : I. *Quaero* num in ordine ad matrimonii contracti validitatem vel nullitatem, collatio vel non collatio baptismi, dum

ignoratur, ex principio praesumptionis definienda sit? Indubius id affirmat doctissimus bonae memoriae Archiepiscopus Patr. Kenrick. In Theologia enim sua Morali (Tr. xxi, n. 48) haec habet: "Si de consortis baptismo non constet, nec certum haberi queat testimonium, in eam propendere oportet sententiam de baptismo, et matrimonii valore, cui favent indicia et adjuncta." Quodsi recte ita sentit laudatus Kenrick: II. *Quaero* ulterius, utrum, dum baptismi collatio ignoratur, principium praesumptionis, in ordine ad valorem matrimonii contracti, rite applicetur in articulis sequentibus?

1. Si pars vel partes acatholicae parentes habuerint ad sectam pertinentes, quae baptismum respuit, hic non est praesumendus.

2. Idem resolvendum, si parentes habuerint pertinentes ad sectam, quae infantium baptismum non admittit, seu in qua non confertur nisi adultis v. g. annum aetatis trigesimum jam adeptis, quemadmodum res se habet in secta Baptistarum.

3. Idem pariter resolvendum, si parentes habuerint, qui dum in vivis essent, professi sint se nolle ad ullam sectam pertinere, seque Ens Supremum honestis potius, ut aiunt, moribus quam *speciali* aliquo cultu honorare.

4. Si parentes habuerint pertinentes ad sectam, quae eumdem ut necessarium habet, vel in qua saltem ordinarie administratur, et iidem parentes in secta sua zelosi fuerint, *praesumendus est baptismus*. (At quid si parentes in secta sua socordes fuerint, aut ad sectam pertinuerint, quae baptismum quidem non respuit, sed eum non habet ut necessarium, et in qua ordinarie non administratur? An in utroque aut alterutro casu praesumendus est baptismus vel non?)[1]

5. Si juxta unius tantum parentis sectam et animi, ut supra, zelosam dispositionem praesumptio faveat baptismo, et hic in educatione prolis de facto et indubie primas habuerit partes, praesumendus est baptismus. Idem resolvo, si, facta inquisitione, ignoretur aut non satis constet uter primas *habuerit partes*; baptismus enim, in ordine ad matrimonium, praesumendus est, cum conjugium semel initum censendum sit valere quamdiu obex *se non prodat*. Sed quid, si certo constet, illius, qui de facto et indubie primas in educatione habuit partes, sectam et animi dispositionem non favere baptismo, dum alterius secta et animi dispositio eidem favet?

1. Verba in parenthesi non fuerunt considerata in Responsione.—*Not. Ed.*

6. Casu quo nulla pro baptismo militat praesumptio, applicanda est regula: *Factum non praesumitur, sed probandum est.* Hujus regulae applicatio in his Foederatis Statibus, ubi inter acatholicos plurimi sunt, qui de Baptismo infantibus suis conferendo nihil aut parum curant, potiori forte jure locum habere debet, quam in multis aliis regionibus.

Quaestiones praefatae ideo praecipue proponuntur, ut ex earum solutione norma habeatur, juxta quam tuto procedi possit in his praesertim casibus: 1. Dum ex duabus partibus acatholicis, ab invicem ut supra separatis, altera in gremium Ecclesiae recipi postulat, et ad alias nuptias convolavit aut convolare cupit. 2. Dum pars catholica, ab acatholica ut supra separata, cum alia conjungi postulat, aut, cum alia jam juncta, ad Sacramenta admitti exoptat.

RESPONSUM.

FERIA 4ª DIE 1ª Augusti 1883.

In Congregatione generali S. R. et Universalis Inquisitionis habita coram Emis. ac Rmis. DD. S. R. E. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei Inquisitoribus Generalibus propositis suprascriptis dubiis, et praehabito Voto DD. Consultorum iidem Emi. decreverunt:

AD I.

Affirmative, peracta tamen investigatione in singulis casibus.

AD II.

Nempe. Utrum dum baptismi collatio ignoratur principium praesumptionis in ordine ad valorem matrimonii contracti rite applicetur in articulis sequentibus? Responderunt: *Affirmative* quoad *primum*, *secundum* et *tertium* articulum, et quoad primam partem *quarti* et primam partem *quinti* numeri, at in hoc postremo articulo, post verba: *habuerit partes* addatur:—"*neque alter conjux cognoscatur positive contrarius collationi baptismi praesumendus est baptismus.*" In reliquis casibus qui adnotantur in secunda parte numeri quinti, recurrendum ad S. Sedem, expositis omnibus rerum locorum et personarum adjunctis, aliisque ad rem facientibus. Ad *sextum:* Provisum in praecedentibus.

J. PELAMI *S. R.* et *U. Inq. Notar.*

CASUS PRACTICUS

SANATIONIS MATRIMONII IN RADICE.

Ex S. Poenitentiaria.

BEATISSIME PATER :—Bertha [1] mulier catholica, diœcesis Parisiensis, exponit quod ipsa, a. 1867, matrimonium rite contraxerat cum (Titio), sed ab eo atrociter verberata, obtenta sententia divortii in sui favorem aufugit in Helvetiam, ibique contractum mere civilem iniit cum (Sempronio) viro catholico, ast ab omni religione alieno, vivente adhuc priore conjuge. E vivis erepto Titio, oratrix præfata a Sempronio obtinere studuit ut coram Ecclesia consensum renovaret, sicque provideretur legitimitati matrimonii ; sed frustra ; nam ille contractum civilem sibi sufficere dixit, constanterque renuit comparere coram sacerdote.

Hisce in adjunctis, nihil oratrici restat nisi ad Sanctitatem Vestram recurrere ad hoc, ut suae miseræ conditioni per sanationem in radice provideatur, ita ut Ecclesiæ sacramentis participare valeat. Et Deus. . .

Sacra Pœnitentiaria, de speciali et expressa Apostolica Auctoritate, Ordinario Parisiensi facultatem concedit, prævio sive per se sive per aliam idoneam ecclesiasticam personam ab eo specialiter deputandam, prædictæ mulieri absolutione a præmissis, cum congrua pœnitentia salutari, matrimonium sic, ut præfertur, nulliter contractum, dummodo consensus perseveret, Apostolica Auctoritate in radice sanandi, prolemque sive susceptam, non tamen in adulterio conceptam, sive suscipiendam, exinde legitiman decernendi ac respective nuntiandi. Præsentes autem litteræ cum attestatione impertitæ executionis, in cancellaria episcopali diligenter custodiantur, ut pro quocumque futuro eventu de matrimonii validitate et prolis legitimitate constare possit, imposita mulieri prædictæ obligatione prudenter monendi virum de hujusmodi sanatione obtenta, ad hoc ut ipse sciat se in legitimo matrimonio versari, necnon remoto scandalo quod occasione similium sanationum oriri potest.

Datum Romæ, in S. Pœnitentiaria, die 25 Aprilis, 1890.

R. *Card*, MONACO P. M.

1 Nominibus veris ficta substituuntur.

DE NOVITATIBUS QUOAD CULTUM.

Ex S. Officio.

FERIA IV, DIE 3 JUNII, 1891.

Nova Emblemata Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu in Eucharistia non esse ab Apostolica Sede approbanda. Ad fovendam fidelium pietatem satis esse imagines SSmi Cordis in Ecclesia jam usitatas et adprobatas; quia cultus erga SSmum Cor Jesu in Eucharistia non est perfectior cultu erga ipsam Eucharistiam neque alius a cultu erga SSmum Cor Jesu. Insuper iidem Patres communicandam mandarunt mentem ab hac Sacra Congregatione jussa Pii Papae IX, sac. mem. panditam feria IV, die 13 Jan., 1875, nempe monendos esse alios etiam scriptores qui ingenia sua acuunt super iis aliisque id generis argumentis, quae novitatem sapiunt, ac sub pietatis specie insuetos cultus titulos etiam per ephemerides promovere student, ut ab eorum proposito desistant, ac perpendant periculum quod subest pertrahendi fideles in errorem etiam fidei dogmata et ansam praebendi Religionis osoribus ad detrahendum puritati doctrinae catholicae et verae pietati.

R. *Card.* MONACO.

CIRCA MATRIMONIUM IN CASU OBITUS PROBABILIS ALTERIUS CONJUGIS.

Ex S. Congreg. S. Officii.

BEATISSIME PATER:

Humiliter exponitur S. V. quod Victoria N. . . . dioecesis N. . . , die 10 maii, 1865, matrimonium contraxit cum Josepho N. . . , ex quo duos liberos habuit. Anno autem, 1870, dictus Josephus ad bellum profectus est et die 19 januarii, 1871, in praelio quod ad civitatem S. Quintini commissum est, disparuit, ut constat ex litteris Ministri, qui militiae praeest, die 11 decembris 1875 datis; nec ex eo tempore ulla fama de eo audita fuit, licet ipsius nomen, die 19 julii, 1882, in diario reipublicae (Journal officiel) promulgatum fuerit. Ideo Josephus jure habitus est ut defunctus et tribunal N. . . , per sententiam diei 4 junii 1886 pronuntiavit quod constat de ejus obitu.

Addendum quod Josephus, si Victoriae fides habenda est, pactum iniisset cum septem e suis sociis ut post praelium convenirent ad eumdem locum, solusque a conventu abfuisset.

Nunc autem Victoria N. . . , jure civili vidua, et 41 annos nata, matrimonium contrahere vellet cum Ludovico N. . . , annos 42 nato, nostrae dioecesis, humiliterque implorant dispensationem super impedimento secundi in linea aequali consanguinitatis gradus.

Causae sunt : 1° Scandalum cohabitationis incestuosae tollendum ; 2° Quatuor liberi legitimandi ; 3° dies fixa ad contractum civilem ineundum, nempe 11ª mensis currentis. Oratores sunt pauperrimi.

N. . . , 2ª aprilis, 1887.

FERIA IV, DE 17 APRILIS, 1887.

In Congregatione Generali habita coram Eminentissimis PP. Cardinalibus, proposito dubio circa obitum Josephi N. . . , instanti ejus uxore Victoria N. . . , quae matrimonium inire cupit cum Ludovico N. . . , ejus consobrino, iidem Eminentissimi Patres decreverunt: *Dummodo ex authenticis documentis et ex testis fide dignis saltem summarie et extrajudicialiter constet non solum de iis quae ab episcopo exponuntur, sed insuper Josephum N. . . sincero animo prosequutum fuisse uxorem et liberos, neque ullam adfuisse causam quare eos desereret, permitti posse Oratrici, ut matrimonium ineat cum Ludovico N. . . , praevia dispensatione super 2° consanguinitatis gradu in linea laterali aequali, pro qua supplicandum Sanctissimo.*

Eadem die ac feria Sanctissimus Eminentissimorum PP. resolutionem approbavit atque petitam gratiam concedere dignatus est.

J. MANCHINI, *S.R. et U.J.Not.*

VINUM DULCE PRO MISSAE SACRIFICIO.

Illme ac Rme Domine.

Precibus ab Amplitudine Tua commendatis N. N. exposito quod vinum dulce, quod pro Missae sacrificio adhiberi solet, in Hispania spiritum ultra proportionem duodecim pro centum naturaliter continet, sequentia dubia solvenda proponebat :

1.—Utrum decem partium spiritus pro centum commixtio ut ex experientia constat, omnino ad vini dulcis conservationem necessaria, continuari possit ?

2.—Utrum vinum ita confectum adhiberi possti in Missae sacrificio

Re ad examen vocata in Congregatione habita feria IV die 15 curr. mensis Emi Dni Card. Inquisitores una mecum Generales decreverunt: *Negative in ordine ad Missae sacrificium.*

Quod dum significo, Deum precor ut Te diu sospitet.

Ampl. Tua addict. in Dno.

R. *Card.* MONACO.

Dno. Archiep. Tarraconen.

Romae d. 19 April, 1891.

DUBIA QUOAD CONFESSIONES MONIALIUM.

Ex Cong. Ep. and Reg.

Archiepiscopus Oregonopolitan. (Infra habetur Archiepiscopus S. Francisci. Inde dubitari potest utrum Dubia ab uno an ab altero fuerint proposita.) Dubia quae sequuntur proposuit, adducendo ad majorem rei claritatem, sextum excerptum a S. Doctore Alphonso di Liguori, in quo dum dicitur, confessores monialium, exacto triennio declarari suspensos, adjicitur: *et hoc valet etiam pro confessariis conservatorium.* (Theol. moral. lib. vi, n. 577.)

1.—Nostrae Charitatis Sorores aliaeque, educationi juvenum addictae, comprehendunturne sub nomine *conservatoriorum?*

2.—Quatenus affirmative, Episcopus potestne confessario auctoritatem conferre pro excipiendis earumdem confessionibus ultra triennium, ratione deficientiae confessariorum idoneorum?

3.—Prohibitio S. Congregationis secumne fert nullitatem absolutionis datae a confessario, per Episcopum approbato ad excipiendas confessiones ultra triennium?

Sacra haec Congr. Ep. et Reg. ad explanationem dubiorum praedictorum, audito prius oraculo Sanctitatis Suae, praemittit, generaliter loquendo, praescriptiones de immutando triennali confessario applicandas esse tam monasteriis et conservatoriis, quam cuilibet mulierum societati, quae vitam degit *more communitatis*, habentes confessarios *ordinarios*, excepto casu quo per peculiaria indulta dispensarentur. Adjicit etiam, quod ipse Sacer Ordo anno 1846, dubio his affini, promoto ab Ordinario Tridentino, vidilicet: "an in singulis trienniis immutandi essent confessarii, etiam quando, ceu evenit Sororibus Charitatis, quae hospitalibus inserviunt, saepe saepius transferuntur de loco et de domo in alium?" Responsum affirmativum dederat, indulgendo eodem tempore facultates Ordinario eosdem confirmandi semel aut bis, consuetis observatis conditionibus ad hoc praescriptis. (Cfr. Bizzarri: Collectanea S.

Cong. Ep. & Reg., p. 126. Ejusmodi declarationes habentur etiam ib, pp. 13, 14 et 26.) Tandem explicite declaravit Sanctitas Sua, quod continuatio ejusdem confessoris in communitate mulierum, ut supra, ultra triennium, absque dispensatione S. Sedis, ad quam exclusive pertinet eandem concedere, secum non fert absolutionum sacramentalium nullitatem, sed tantum illicitum exercitium istius sacri ministerii.

Ad removendam dubietatem, quae adhuc in animo Archiepiscopi S. Francisci permanebat, non erit abs re animadversio, quodsi Sorores aut Filiae Charitatis S. Vincentii de Paulo e sua Dioecesi consuetudinem habeant aut debeant confessionem peragere apud parochum in Ecclesia parochiali aut in alia Ecclesia publica, casum non esse, cui applicari possit prohibitio confessariis facto pro sequendi ultra triennium; eo quod ipsa infligitur unice confessariis ordinariis, qui ad excipiendas confessiones monasteria, conservatoria, aliaque petunt loca, in quibus mulieres degunt in forma communitatis.—Ex. litt. S. Cong. Ep. and Reg. 20 Julii 1875. (ap. Act. S. Sed. xxiv, p. 711.)

ANNIVERSARIUM CONSECRATIONIS EPISCOPI.

Anniversarium consecrationis episcopi, si accidentaliter impeditur festo mobili ritus duplicis primae classis, est omittendum, si autem quotannis ita impediretur, reponendum est.

Ex S.R.C., 12 Dec., 1891.

USUS PILEOLI IN MISSA SOLEMNI.

Cardinales et episcopi et quotquot ex indulto Apostolico gaudent usu pileoli, sacro adsistentes, sive seorsum sive collegialiter, tenentur detegere caput ad cantum sacri Evangelii et dum thurificantur.

Ex Congreg. Caeremon., 20 Maji, 1890.

OFFICIUM VOTIVUM IN CALENDARIO ROMANO.

Ex privilegio utentes Calendario romano, an debeant feria III, si Officium Votivum dici potest, dicere Officium SS. Apostolorum an vero illud SS. Petri et Pauli?

Romano: 18 Maj: 1889.—Hodiernus Moderator Academiae liturgicae in Urbe a S. R. C. humillime postulavit insequentis Dubii declarationem nimirum: In Decreto *Urbis and Orbis* "Per apostolicas Litteras" n. 1. legitur: "*Feria III non impedita assignatum Officium votivum de Sanctis Apostolis*"—deinde subditur: "*Romae vero de Sanctis Petro et Paulo,*" cum autem plures Communitates Religiosae, in majoris unitatis gratiam cum Sancta Sede utantur Calendario Cleri Romani proprio, quaeritur: An illa verba: "Romae vero de Sanctis Petro et Paulo" eos tantum afficiant, qui Romae materialiter degunt, an alios etiam qui Calendario Cleri Romani utentes, extra degunt quidem, sed ad Officium quod spectat, quid unum efficiunt cum Clero Romano?

Et Sacra eadem Congr. ad resolutionem infrascripti Secretarii, re mature perpensa, ita proposito Dubio rescribendum censuit, videlicet: *Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam.*

Atque ita rescripsit die 18 Maji, 1889.

C. *Card.* LAURENZI, *Praef.*
VINC. NUSSI, *Secretarius.*

BOOK REVIEW.

HISTOIRE DU BREVIAIRE ROMAIN. Par Pierre Batiffol. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, Editeurs, 82 Rue Bonaparte, 1893.

The present work confirms the high regard which Dr. Batiffol has inspired by his previous publications as a thorough and conscientious exponent of early Christian literature in some of its unrecognized phases.

The history of the Roman Breviary has of recent years, that is, since the Vatican Council, when a general reform of the Latin Office was proposed, called for renewed attention among scholars. Baeumer, Pleithner (treating of the first four centuries), Mgr. de Roskovany, and in a manner L. Duchesne in his *origines du culte chrétien* offer much solid material to the student who is interested in tracing the historical development of the canonical hours.

Our author, whilst not ignoring, as is evident from his pages, the conclusions of the modern writers on this subject, has, nevertheless, pursued an entirely independent course in the use of existing material which covers the learned researches of Cardinals Bona and Tommasi, of Thomassin, Mabillon, and other no less illustrious sources. His tendency, too, as we shall see, is a distinctly practical one, although he keeps entirely aloof from discussing the devotional or the ritual aspect of the Office. As an historian he presents to us the elements of liturgical archeology upon which the subsequent development of the Breviary is based; as a critic he points out the *lacunæ* which are to be filled so as to complete the historic structure; and as an apologist he pleads for the preservation—whatever later reforms might be undertaken—of the traditional liturgy represented in the Breviary of Urban VIII. This he calls the *Vulgate* of the Roman Office, an historic edition from which the Holy See has ever shown a wise reluctance to permit variations. It corresponds in all but minor details to the Roman Office used in the XIIIth century; and as Urban the VIII had striven to consolidate the form of public prayer which had been used for three centuries before him in the Roman Church, so Innocent III built his reforms of the Breviary upon the traditional liturgy observed in the

Basilica of St. Peter since the VIIIth century, the principal elements of which are traceable to the apostolic age.

Although no decided reformation of the Roman Breviary has taken place since Urban's time, constant additions and occasional variations have been made in the typical edition published after the Council of Trent. The additions are mainly due to the introduction of feasts of saints canonized in process of time. Thus the original equilibrium between the Offices *de Tempore* and the *Proprium Sanctorum* was gradually destroyed. This, together with many other, though incidental and minor defects in the body of separate Offices, caused a movement at the beginning of the last century, particularly in France, in behalf of a new revision the main purpose of which was to reconstruct the calendar and to reduce the feasts celebrated as *duplicia* and *semiduplicia* to the rank of simples. The matter was taken up definitely by Benedict XIV who proposed to make a complete revision of *calendarium*, *text*, and *rubrics*, a labor to which he intended personally to devote his genius and industry. Unfortunately the great Pontiff died before being able to accomplish the task, which implied a magnificent promise of chastened beauty in a work of devotional art, reared by the master-hand of Christ's own spouse, the Church. However, much of the preparatory work which he had committed to a special congregation has remained in three volumes of MS. under the title: *Acta et scripta autographa in sacra congregatione particulari a Benedicto XIV deputata pro reformatione Breviarii romani, 1741; in tres tomos distributa et appendicem.* We owe the fortunate finding of these documents, which had been entirely lost sight of, to the learned Mgr. de Roskovany, who discovered them in the Corsini library at Rome not many years ago. In analyzing these labors our author throws fresh light upon the historical value of the Office as we now possess it and points out the lines to be followed in the proposed revision. We cannot but endorse the plea of Dr. Batiffol, the superiority of whose erudition and the soundness of whose reasoning gives to his work a high place among literary works of the same character and subject. His critical ability and instinct of true devotion cause him to recognize and expose in their true light the futile attempts which have been made at various times to destroy the harmony of the old Roman Office, by the introduction of elements foreign to the spirit of Catholic, that is, universal piety. The author has in short, contributed a Keystone to the classical literature of a subject which must always interest the

ecclesiastical student, and in this case we find in the writer also the faculty of literary elegance which renders the reading of this history of the Roman Breviary a diversion no less than a work of culture.

I.—LITURGIA SACRAMENTORUM, ex praescripto Ritualis Romani servanda.

II.—LITURGIA SACRAMENTALIUM, ex praescripto Ritualis Romani servanda. Auctore Sac. Jo. Bapt. Pighi, D. S. Th.—Veronae, Edidit Felix Cinquetti.

The handbooks of S. Liturgy favorably known and used, we believe, in most of our American Seminaries are DeHerdt, Wappelhorst and Schneider's *Manuale*. These are of distinct merit as ordinary reference books and as such quite indispensable to the cleric. As a rule, it is important to the student that he have made himself familiar with the theological works of reference which he may have to consult later, by previous systematic use of them as texts in the Seminary. This is especially true of dogmatic and moral theology and would apply also to liturgy where the latter is taught in conjunction with pastoral theology. As a matter of fact, however, the study of liturgy is usually considered as a discipline in rubrics which receives attention at most two hours a week. Thus it becomes manifestly impossible to cover the ground laid out, for example in DeHerdt's three volumes, or even in Wappelhorst's Compendium; much has to be passed over unnoticed and this itself is a defect because it begets in the student a sense of diffidence and inaccuracy as regards his practical knowledge.

Unless, therefore, the branch of pastoral theology be combined with that of liturgy, it would be an advantage to have a short, yet sufficiently precise congest of the liturgical precepts which regulate the administration of the sacraments and kindred priestly functions.

It is no exaggeration, from this point of view, to say that the two small volumes before us fulfill this need to precision. The author, professor of moral theology and liturgy in the Episcopal Seminary of Verona had used for a text-book *a Carpo's Compendiosa Bibliotheca liturgica* which presents some of the difficulties mentioned above in the way of practical utility. Desirous of finding a remedy he worked out a short compendium which was meant to satisfy all immediate demands of the student and yet to keep open before him the avenue of additional, though less freqently needed, information in larger works of reference.

The first volume, published in 1889, which treats of the sacraments has been complemented by a second containing definite canons and explanations concerning blessings, processions, exorcisms and other ordinary ecclesiastical functions. Professors of liturgy in our Seminaries, would, we think, prefer this to any other book, as a regular *text* in class. It harmonizes of course perfectly with the Roman Ritual, a feature which is sometimes lost sight of in DeHerdt or in such English works as Dr. O'Loan's, who borrows with partiality from French authorities.

DIE FRANCISCANER IN DEN VEREINIGTEN STAATEN NORD-AMERICAS.—Von der Endeckung durch Columbus bis auf unsere Zeit. Von Bonaventura Hammer, O.S.F.—Köln. 1892. I. P. Bachem.

The celebration of the discovery of America four hundred years ago by Columbus gives renewed interest to the history of the Franciscan missions, whose members were active for the evangelization of the New World from the first day when the Spaniards set foot upon it unto our own time. Indeed the discovery itself of America might be said to have been due in great part to one of these zealous sons of the Seraphic Father, St. Francis; for P. Juan Perez gave not only hospitality to Columbus when, abandoned by his former patrons and a beggar, he knocked at the gate of La Rabida, but he was also directly instrumental in procuring from the Spanish Court the necessary means to fit out vessels for the first expedition. P. Perez became afterwards an active missionary among the Indians. A brother of the order of St. Francis, P. Garcia de Padilla, became the first Bishop of the newly discovered world, on the Island of San Domingo; and the first Bishop of the American continent, of the Sea of Darien, was, according to Fr. Lambing likewise a Franciscan, by name P. Juan de Quevedo, who having brought with him many brethren of his order to spread and confirm the faith of the natives, died in the year 1519.

P. Hammer's history does not propose to cover the foundations of the Franciscan order in the two Americas but limits itself to the United States. It is valuable, not only as a succinct record of the establishment of churches and educational institutions by the sons of St. Francis, but furnishes at the same time an important chapter to the general hagiography of the Catholic Church, since the number of Franciscans who suffered death in the United States alone, for the

sake of their faith, exceeds half a hundred. The growth of religion among us is therefore not without its large watering in the blood of saints.

The English reader will, of course, find the main facts here collated in the monumental history of the late Dr. Gilmary Shea (History of the Catholic Church in the United States) who shortly before his death revised this present work, and added, as the author tells us, some original notes to it. P. Hammer's labor is thus well authenticated from a purely historical point of view and furnishes a creditable contribution to a future history of the separate religious orders which have been active in the evangelization and culture of the New World.

MANUALE DE INDULGENTIIS. Auctore Benedicto Melata.—Romæ: Ex Typographia A. Befani, 1892.

The S. Congregation has, after due examination, given its approval to this new work on indulgences by Dr. Melata whose concise *Manuale Theologiæ Moralis* we had occasion, some time ago, to introduce favorably to our readers. Whilst the standard work of P. Beringer, S.J. translated from the German in several modern languages, is the most complete and reliable compendium on the subject, it is not sufficiently accessible to the theological student and missionary priest to dispense with a manual in Latin such as this.

The principal motive which prompted the author to digest the existing literature on the subject of indulgences into a hand book of moderate size for the use of the clergy, was, as he expresses it, "potissimum animabus piacularibus flammis addictis solamen procurandum." This motive gives us a key to the practical worth of the volume which consists of two distinct parts (separately paged). In the first, the author discusses the nature, kind and application of indulgences, both in general and particular, following the division which is naturally suggested by the subject matter itself. The second part contains two appendices, one giving certain pontifical documents of importance and which refer to various confraternities including the Association of Christian Families, recently established by Leo XIII; the other containing the formulas of the usual blessings to which special indulgences are attached.

As a theologian, Dr. Melata treats his subject, wherever occasion requires it, with admirable precision yet without partiality. An instance in point is his manner of touching the old question whether

the *status gratiae* is absolutely required to obtain an indulgence, or at least its application for the souls in purgatory. Here the author briefly states the opposing views of the leading theologians, Suarez, S. Alphonsus and Palmieri, and, without pronouncing in favor of one or the other, defines what is admitttd as certain and can be followed with safety, as for instance, that the indulgence of the "privileged altar" is gained by the celebration of Mass regardless of the "status animæ" of the priest who offers it.

We notice among the formulæ the exceptional privilege of the Redemptorist fathers who may invest in the five scapulars by employing a single form. This is useful to know since the recent restrictions of the right to invest in the scapulars have lessened the number of those who formerly made use of the faculties granted under more easy conditions.

As the loss of many indulgences, both to living and dead, is due frequently to a want of exactness in complying with prescribed details, which in turn arises less from disregard than from defective knowledge of the essential requisites, the clergy will no doubt welcome this manual which offers itself as a means of ready and reliable information on a subject of much practical importance.

COELESTE PALMETUM. Lectissimis pietatis exercitiis ornatum studio et opera R. P. Gulielmi Nakateni, S.J. Editio Ratisbon. secunda, revisa et aucta a Matth. Aymans, S.J.—Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci, Cincinnati, Fred. Pustet. 1893.

A precious old book is this, of approved devotions, which has taught many a cleric to reach the goal of sanctity. How to pray and what to pray for should not be a difficult science for those whose office is to prepare themselves for the work of the priesthood; and yet the student needs a staff along the slippery way, even where the noisy world does not distract his thoughts, lest the very insecurity of his foothold keep the mind too much on self instead of turning it to God. Such a staff is this little book, cut from a heavenly garden in which many saintly priests have walked, and containing the vitality of virtuous blossom and fruit. It points out a choice of pious exercises for every day, and week and month, and many wholesome directions accompany the garnered treasures of prayer which the great saints of old and late have rendered doubly precious by their use of them.—*Faxit Deus, ut fructus uberrimos ex frequenti hujus libelli usu percipiat pius lector!*

DE LA VITA DI SAN BENEDETTO. Discorso Storico. D. Luigi Tosti. Edizione illustrata.—Montecassino. 1892.

The principal source from which historians of the life of St. Benedict have drawn their facts is to be found in the "Dialogues" of St. Gregory the Great. He, although not a contemporary of the holy patriarch, had known some of his immediate disciples such as Constantine and Simplicius who succeeded him in the government of Montecassino; also Valentinian and Honoratus of Subiaco, all of whom were trustworthy witnesses of the occurrences related by the Pontiff-historian. Some things, however, not mentioned by St. Gregory are related in an old poem by a monk named Marcus who describes, during the lifetime of the Saint, his first arrival at the mountain and how the holy abbot's words gave him exceeding peace, so that he felt assured ever after of his salvation.

Hunc ego cum scelerum depressus fasce subissem,
Depositum sensi pondus abesse mihi.
Credo quod et foelix vita fruar insuper illa,
Oras pro Marco si, Benedicte, tuo.

Much incidental information is found in the life of St. Maurus and in the acts of St. Placidus written likewise by immediate disciples of the Saint; but, since it is known that these last mentioned works have been interpolated by some ill advised hand, their statements have been generally distrusted, although, in the judgment of critics the internal evidence is clear enough to allow of a separation between the true and the fictitious. No doubt we should possess a more exhaustive knowledge of the man who may be justly said to have brought Christianity, and with it civilization, to western Europe, if it had not been for the destruction of the convent of Montecassino by Zotton, first Duke of Benevent, toward the end of the sixth century.

But despite all this can we doubt for a moment that there has been preserved in Monte-Cassino a living tradition as faithful as ever record in folio could trace it for us? The Benedettino-Cassinese at least is free from the suspicion, as from the necessity, of having recourse to invention in order to declare the greatness of the holy Founder. St. Benedict's words were the interpretation of the Christian law from the sixth century to the fourteenth. For five hundred years his religious rule was the sole pattern of the ascetical community-life in the Western Church, and the giants of sanctity and learning, the guardians of discipline and culture who grew up

under the influence of Benedict's rule, even only at Monte-Cassino, leavening all Europe with the principles of Christian civilization, are evidence of a power which may defy attempts at invention to prove its existence. But if the monks could have forgotten the details of their Father's life; if the prattling fountains, the faithful echoes from grove and rocky cliff have ceased to bear witness to the daily life of him who seemed to charm the very elements, unless on that one memorable eve when his sweet sister Scholastica called the heavens to her aid, surely his rule of monastic life has remained to us as a clear evidence of his own truest self. When we know the heart and mind, and the path into which both force the body in its ascent to heaven, we surely have enough from which to draw a true picture of one such man as was St. Benedict. Hildemar, Rupert, Peter the Deacon, St. Hildegarde, and a hundred other saints and churchmen have feasted on the substance of that rule and written the life of the Saint in commenting upon it for the benefit of succeeding generations.

The abbé Tosti has had much more from which to limn a history of the founder of the Benedictine order. What there is of Monte-Cassino, old and new, he knows it by heart. He has spent a toil-some life, sweetened withal by love for the task, to ransack its treasures; and an evidence of his conscientious labors is the long row of stately volumes whose contents are more or less closely connected with the inner story of the monastery in which St. Benedict had dwelt centuries over a thousand years ago, and where a few silent monks are still keeping vigil as guardians of the sacred monument, by sufferance of a civil hostile government. The *Storia della Badia di Montecassino* which the learned abbé Tosti completed some years ago gives us a better insight into the character of St. Benedict, its founder, than many details of his outward life could furnish.

Hence the *Discorso Storico* which the indefatigable disciple of the Saint presents to us here, though indeed but an outline, is instinct with the touch of well-informed genius, which makes it a living reality, upon a strong and rightly disposed background. Those who have followed Luigi Tosti in his historical researches of past years will understand why in the prologue of this Life he can say with apparent depreciation of an excellent work: *Le pagine che seguono non sono che una semplice intuizione storica della vita del santo. Chi a vaghezza di leggerle, non indugi; perchè questo libro è, come forse tante altri, "folium quod vento rapitur."* One

might feel like protesting against such modesty if, having read the pages of the *Discorso* thus far the charm which invites a further perusal of the work had not already settled upon the lover of sacred history.

The critic has nothing to say; the abbé does not go out of his own domain; if he cites English writers like Newman it is only because they confirm what he himself so fairly assumes. The monks of Monte-Cassino have many traditions regarding their venerated Master and Father, and these although of no worth or incomprehensible to the sceptic, assume a sacred and historic interest in the eyes of those who know the discreet sincerity of the writer to be equal to the opportunities which he has had for collecting facts on the subject of his discourse.

Among the interesting documents published in connection with this *vita* we may count that of the complete text of Marco's verses and the note of the Benedectine Macarty concerning the antiquity of the monastery of, what he insists is the proper name, the *Casinates*. We believe there is a translation of the work being made by the English Benedictines who bid fair to revive the old spirit of their order in the literary field of Europe; perhaps some day we may experience a like activity in the New World where the missionary zeal of the patriarch's sons has sown the envangelical seed. "S. Benedetto viaggia ancora pel mondo, *pertransiens benefaciendo.*"

CONSTITUTIONES DOGMATICAE SACROSANCTI ŒCUMENICI CONCILII VATICANI—Ex Ipsis ejus actis explicatæ atque illustratæ a Theodoro Granderath, S.J. Friburgi Brisg.—B. Herder, 1892, St. Louis, Mo.

The Vatican Council which opened its first session in December, 1869, had not concluded its deliberations when force of circumstances, political and other, obliged the consulting bodies to disperse. This fact, however, did not prevent certain definite results being reached which the Council had primarily proposed to itself. These results are embodied partly in the *Acta* and *Decreta*, published through the care of our author in the *Collectio Lacensis* of which they constitute the seventh volume. But the documents given to the public in this collection of Councils form only the crystallized issue of valuable deliberations which explain their meaning and purpose. The historians and commentators of previous Councils such as the fourth Lateran or even that of Trent bear witness to the serious disadvantages which arise from the lack of

minute records in regard to the origin and occasion of certain decrees when a subsequent doubt arose as to their special application under variously arising circumstances; for the full sense of some forms of legislation can be ascertained only by tracing them to their primary formation and viewing them in the light of previous discussion. In this respect the Vatican Council offers a decided advantage to the theologian who would rest his teaching on its definitions. All the preliminary discussions upon propositions *de fide et disciplina* prepared by representative theologians and canonists, examined by special commissions, and finally voted upon in separate and general assemblies, are minutely recorded.

For an insight into these records and an illustration of their practical use in the domain of dogmatic teaching we are indebted to the labors of P. Granderath. Perhaps he may be said to be the one man who is complete master of the field into which he leads us. This is saying more than that he is a competent historian of the Vatican Council. The complex, though withal perfect, organism of that world-parliament which legislates for all classes of all nations, for all the moral and physical possibilities of moral activity, has been described by more than one of its ablest co-operators, and our author, in one of his *Prolegomena*, repeats the order of proceeding in order to illustrate the evolution of the two Constitutions on which he undertakes to comment. These are I, *Constitutio dogmatica de fide catholica*, and II, *Constitutio dogmatica prima de Ecclesia Christi.*

The subject matter *pro rebus ad fidem pertinentibus* was prepared in the first instance by a special deputation, one of four, to whom were intrusted respectively the drawing up of *schemata pro rebus disciplinae ecclesiasticae*, *pro rebus ordinum regularium*, and *pro rebus ritus Orientalis et Apostol. Missionum*, besides the one concerning dogmatic definitions mentioned before. This latter was to embody the Catholic Doctrine in a constitution with special reference to the errors of modern rationalism. (*Schema Constitutionis dogmaticae de doctrina catholica contra multiplices errores ex rationalismo derivatos.*)

A brief illustration will show the care and scrutiny to which every detail of the scheme was subjected.—The Constitution *de fide* begins with the words: "Sancta Romana Catholica Ecclesia credit etc." To these words two amendments were proposed. One of the Fathers desired that the word "Romana" be omitted. Another wished the expression to be changed to "Catholica atque

Romana Ecclesia" or, if this did not meet the approval of the Fathers, that a comma be inserted between the words "Catholica" and "Romana." The Secretary detailed for the purpose takes copy of the two amendments which had been previously put in writing by the members who offer them, all being kept informed of the subject proposed for discussion. A sub-secretary goes to the *ambo* and reads out in a loud voice: It is proposed that at the beginning of the first chapter the words be simply: "Sancta Catholica Ecclesia credit etc." Then the Cardinal President of the Council asks: "The Fathers who assent to the emendation just read please rise and remain standing until their vote in favor of this change has been taken." Only a few rise. The President after a pause says: "It is evident that by far the larger number of the Fathers are against the change.—Let now all the Fathers rise who are opposed to the emendation and remain standing etc." A similar process is observed in regard to the second amendment, but some of the Fathers express the desire that time be allowed to weigh the merits of the last proposed change of inserting the comma. The Presidents agree to let the vote be suspended until a specified time next day, and the deliberations continue.

The commentary of P. Granderath upon the first Constitution embraces, besides a history of its development previous to and in the Council, a detailed rationale of the initial terms, finally adopted by the Fathers in the thirty-seventh session, "Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia." Other topics which the Constitution opens for discussion are: The possibility of a certain natural cognition of God; the Catholic doctrine regarding the S. Scriptures; and whether the Council teaches that those who have once received the Catholic faith can change or doubt the same without incurring the guilt of a *peccatum formale*, a sense which the words of the definition "Illi qui fidem sub Ecclesiae magisterio susceperunt, nullam unquam habere possunt justam causam mutandi aut in dubium fidem eandem revocandi," do not express.

The second part of the commentary touches in detail the various points of controversy concerning the Primacy and Pontifical Infallibility set forth and defined by the Constitution *de Ecclesia*.

All this work is of great value to the student of dogmatic theology, because the author holds close, not only to the definitions, but also to the animus of the Church defining in Council. He has had exceptional facilities for determining this animus, which is contained in his fountains. Among these are, besides the *Acta* and *Decreta*,